ILLIBERAL SECURITY PRACTICES OF LIBERAL STATES IN THE POST 9/11 ERA: ABERYSTWYTH & PARIS SCHOOLS COMPARED

A Master's Thesis

by
TUĞÇE TÜRE

Department of
International Relations
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University
Ankara
September 2012

ILLIBERAL SECURITY PRACTICES OF LIBERAL STATES IN THE POST 9/11 ERA: ABERYSTWYTH & PARIS SCHOOLS COMPARED

Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

TUĞÇE TÜRE

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2012

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assoc. Prof. Pınar Bilgin
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assist. Prof. Tore Fougner
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Dr. Başak İnce
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

ILLIBERAL SECURITY PRACTICES OF LIBERAL STATES
IN THE POST 9/11 ERA:
ABERYSTWYTH & PARIS SCHOOLS COMPARED

Türe, Tuğçe
M.A., Department of International Relations
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Pınar Bilgin

September 2012

The relationship between security and liberty is an issue that has always attracted scholarly attention. After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, this issue received a new lease of life in the literature. This is because some liberal states have increasingly adopted security practices that are in conflict with liberal principles. These illiberal practices of liberal states have had implications for non-state referents in the context of the war on terror. This thesis examines the question of what the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states are for referents other than states in the context of the war on terror. While examining this question, this thesis adopts a critical perspective by bringing in the perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School in a comparative manner. It then, examines this question through a case study on the UK as a liberal state by comparing the perspectives of the Aberystwyth and Paris Schools. In doing so, it offers the argument that seeing liberty and security as separate values that are in conflict with each other results in further insecurity for non-state referents in the context of the war on terror. In this way, this thesis emphasizes the need for going beyond the balance argument of the relationship between liberty and security.

Keywords: Critical Security Studies, Liberty, Security, Illiberal Security Practices, Liberal State, 9/11, Aberystwyth School, Paris School, the United Kingdom

ÖZET

9/11 SONRASI DÖNEMDE LİBERAL DEVLETLERİN LİBERAL OLMAYAN GÜVENLİK UYGULAMALARI: ABERYSTWYTH & PARIS EKOLLERİ'NİN KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR İNCELEMESİ

Türe, Tuğçe
Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü
Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Pınar Bilgin

Eylül 2012

Güvenlik ve özgürlük arasındaki ilişki akademik dünyada her zaman ilgi çeken bir konu olagelmiştir. Özellikle 9/11 terör saldırılarından sonra, bu konuya olan ilgi daha da artmıştır. Bu artan ilginin nedeni, 9/11 terör saldırılarından sonra liberal devletlerin artan bir şekilde liberal prensiplerle çelişen güvenlik uygulamaları benimsemeleridir. Teröre karşı savaş bağlamında liberal devletlerin benimsedikleri bu liberal olmayan güvenlik uygulamaları ise devlet dışı aktörler için bir takım olumsuz sonuçlar doğurmaktadır. Bu çalışma, liberal devletlerin liberal olmayan güvenlik uygulamalarının devlet dışı aktörler üzerindeki etkilerini teröre karşı savaş bağlamında Aberystwyth ve Paris Ekollerini karşılaştırmalı bir biçimde bir araya getirerek eleştirel bir bakış açısından incelemektedir. Bu amaçla, liberal bir devlet olan Birleşik Krallık örnek vakası çerçevesinde, Aberystwyth ve Paris Ekolleri karşılaştırılmaktadır. Bu inceleme sonucunda, tez özgürlük ve güvenliğin birbirleriyle çelişen ayrı değerler olarak görülmesinin teröre karşı savaş bağlamında devlet dışı aktörler için daha fazla güvensizlik ile sonuçlandığını göstermektedir. Böylelikle, özgürlük ve güvenlik arasında denge ilişkisi olduğunu savunan argümanın aşılmasının gerekliliğine vurgu yapılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eleştirel Güvenlik Çalışmaları, Özgürlük, Güvenlik, Liberal Olmayan Güvenlik Uygulamaları, Liberal Devlet, 9/11, Aberystwyth Ekolü, Paris Ekolü, Birleşik Krallık

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special thanks to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Pınar Bilgin for her constant guidance for and comments on the thesis. Without her invaluable assistance, this thesis would not be possible.

I would like to express my special thanks to Assist. Prof. Tore Fougner and Dr. Başak İnce, who kindly accepted to sit in this thesis committee and who provided me with valuable recommendations on my thesis.

I would also like to express my special thanks to TÜBİTAK for its financial support during my graduate study at Bilkent University, without which I would have some troubles to conduct this research.

I am also grateful to my professors at the Middle East Technical University and at İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University for their invaluable guidance throughout my undergraduate and graduate studies.

I would also like to thank my family for their support and understanding throughout my entire life.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my best colleague Kaan Reyhan for his friendship, advice, and encouragement throughout my graduate studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT..... iii
ÖZET..... iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS…… v
TABLE OF CONTENTS..... vi

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION..... 1

1.1 The Problem and Literature Review..... 1
1.2 Research Question, Key Concepts and Preliminary Argument..... 10
1.3 Structure..... 17

CHAPTER 2: ILLIBERAL SECURITY PRACTICES OF LIBERAL STATES IN THE POST 9/11 ERA FROM THE ABERYSTWYTH SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE..... 20

2.1 Introduction..... 20
2.2 What is Security for the Aberystwyth School?.....…… 21
2.2.1 Security as a Derivative Concept…….…… 21
2.2.2 Deepening and Broadening of Security…..……..……..... 22
2.2.3 Security and Emancipation……..……..... 25
2.2.4 Individual as the Main Referent of Security..……..…… 28
2.2.5 Non-Dualistic Logic of Means and Ends..……...……...…….. 31
2.3 Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of Liberal States for Referents Other than State…..…….…….. 34
2.3.1 Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of Liberal States for Individual Security……... 36
2.4 How to Overcome the Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of Liberal States for Non-State Referents? The Aberystwyth School Perspective…….. 43
2.5 Conclusion…… 49

CHAPTER 3: ILLIBERAL SECURITY PRACTICES OF LIBERAL STATES IN THE POST 9/11 ERA FROM THE PARIS SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE..…… 51

3.1 Introduction.…….…….. 51
3.2 What is Security from the Perspective of the Paris School?…… 52
3.2.1 Interdisciplinary Perspective of the Paris School……..……... 52
3.2.2 The Notions of Security and Insecurity……..... 54

3.2.3 Security as a Result of a Process of (In)securitization..…….…... 55
3.2.3.A The Field of (In)Security Professionals..……. 58
3.3 Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of
Liberal States for Referents Other than State..…….... 60
3.3.1 The Ban-opticon Dispositif…….. 65
3.3.2 Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of
Liberal States for Civil Liberties, Immigrants,
Asylum-Seekers, and Social Cohesion…… 70
3.4 How to Overcome the Implications of Illiberal
Security Practices of Liberal States for Non-State
Referents? The Paris School Perspective…..…….. 75
3.5 Conclusion.…… 78

CHAPTER 4: THE UNITED KINGDOM CASE IN THE POST
9/11 ERA: ABERYSTWYTH AND PARIS SCHOOLS
COMPARED……. 80

4.1 Introduction…..…….. 80
4.2 Post 9/11 Counter-Terrorism Legislation in the United Kingdom……..... 81
4.3 The Case of the UK from the Perspective of the Aberystwyth School…..… 87
4.4 The Case of the UK from the Perspective of the Paris School..…… 96
4.5 Conclusion……... 102

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION..... 106

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 113

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Problem and Literature Review

The relationship between security and liberty has been one of the crucial issues that touch upon the lives of individual human beings around the world. This is because understandings of the relationship between liberty and security have shaped the security practices of states all around the world (Neocleous, 2007: 132). The main assumption shared by politicians and security agents is that a balance is maintained in the relationship between liberty and security (Tsoukala, 2006). In line with this assumption, states sacrifice liberty in favor of security when they are faced with a security threat.

Following the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on 11 September 2001 and the subsequent war on terror, liberal states have implemented new counter-terrorism measures. These counter-terrorism measures have been adopted based on the assumption that striking a new balance between security and liberty in favor of security is necessary in the context of the war terror (Waldron,

2003: 191). Through seeking a new balance between liberty and security in favor of security, liberal states have contradicted with basic principles and ideas of liberalism in the post 9/11 period. The security practices of liberal states adopted in the name of security from terrorism threat have created security consequences for non-state referents.

Liberal states' implementation of security practices that contradict with liberal ideas and principles in the post 9/11 era has led to reconsidering some questions. What kind of a relationship exists between liberty and security? Are they separate values? Are they conflicting values? Is it possible to have both of them at the same time and to the same degree? Which one of them is more important? Is it possible to have security through sacrificing from liberty? These are the main questions that constitute the major debates in the literature concerning the relationship between liberty and security.

After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, two basic answers to the above questions provided by two traditional approaches have been discussed. These two approaches are conservative and liberal approaches. From the perspective of these traditional approaches, liberty and security are two distinct values that are in conflict with each other. The traditional approaches think of the relationship between liberty and security in terms of a balance. This balance argument necessitates a trade-off between liberty and security. Within the traditional approaches, according to the conservative approach, it is necessary to strike a balance in favor of security (Etzioni, 2007; Hobbes, 1999 [1651]; Hoffman, 2011; Mearsheimer, 2002, Morgenthau, 1973;

Schwarzenberger, 1941; Walt, 2005). For the liberal approach, liberty and security need to be balanced in favor of liberty (Ackerman, 2004; Bovard, 2003; Berlin, 1958; Locke, 1823 [1689]; Starr, 2002; Wilkinson, 2011).

According to the conservative approach, to strike a balance between security and liberty in favor of security is necessary. According to Thomas Hobbes (1999 [1651]), whose politics has provided a basis for the realist understanding of security studies, having security is a precondition in order to enjoy liberty; therefore, if your security is threatened, giving up some liberty in the name of security is necessary. In the *Leviathan*, Hobbes (1999 [1651]) argues that in the state of nature, human beings enjoy excessive freedom; however, this absolute freedom creates chaos and mutual destruction. In the state of nature, human beings have unconstrained liberty meaning that they have limitless freedom to do whatever they want. In the state of nature, it is very easy for men to come into conflict. Since men are "equal, than unequal" in the state of nature, when they want the same thing, the emergence of conflict and mutual destruction is very likely (Hobbes, 1999 [1651]: 107). Therefore, Hobbes argues that restriction of freedom is necessary since this limitless liberty turns into a license for destruction of other individual human beings. Hobbes (1999 [1651]: 147) argues that "for the attaining of peace" people limit their liberty with artificial chains, which are civil laws and sovereign authority. Consequently, for Hobbes, there is a dual hierarchical relationship. The first hierarchy is between security and liberty. Security is the ultimate value and the intrinsic goal. This is because security is about survival and death. Liberty, which Hobbes thinks is not possible under the risk of death, is secondary to the security. The second hierarchy is between individual and state.

According to Hobbes, survival of the state is prior to the survival of individual. Individual security can be sacrificed in the name of collective security.

Many academics from realist understanding of security have supported the security view of Hobbes (See for example, Morgenthau, 1973; Schwarzenberger, 1941). Liberal norms and values have been thought to be secondary to the security of state. According to this understanding of security, the use of means that contradict with the value of liberty is legitimate and necessary for the sake of the survival of the state. Security of the state constitutes the primary concern of states, for these scholars.

In line with the arguments of Hobbes, Morgenthau, and Schwarzenberger, some of the neorealist scholars such as Walt and Mearsheimer have emphasized the priority of security for states (Mearsheimer, 2002; Walt, 2005). These scholars have argued that states need to adopt any measure that is necessary for the security of state as a response to the terrorist threat posed after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. According to these scholars, after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, states' concerns for security have increased. Therefore, states have needed to seek for security by adopting all kinds of necessary measures. For these scholars, security is the main concern of states. As a result, it can be argued that from the perspectives of these scholars, sacrificing liberty is possible in the name of state security.

Some scholars who specialize in the relationship between liberty and security have argued that it is inevitable to reestablish a balance between liberty and security

in favor of security in the post 9/11 era (Etzioni, 2004; Hoffman, 2011). From this perspective, security and liberty are considered as separate values that need to be balanced in favor of security while faced with a threat. For example, Etzioni (2008: 101) emphasizes other values' conditionality on security by stating that "only once security is reasonably secured do people become keen to have their legal and political rights respected". Based on this understanding, it is argued that there is a need to tilt the balance between security and liberty in favor of security in the context of the war on terror.

As opposed to the conservative approach that assumes a balancing relationship between liberty and security in favor of security, the liberal approach calls for striking a balance in favor of liberty. For some liberal thinkers like John Locke, liberty is the ultimate value for the society and it is the only justification for security measures (Locke, 1823 [1689]; Tesón, 2005: 60). For these thinkers, order is necessary but not the ultimate value, it is necessary for the purpose of the preservation of natural rights. Therefore, the state and its security practices are only justifiable for the preservation of liberty (Tesón, 2005: 60, 65-66). Unlike Hobbes, Locke (1823 [1689]: 141) argues that the state of nature is characterized by "perfect freedom" without any sovereign power. For Locke (1823 [1689]: 106, 107, 108), in the state of liberty, people are equal "without subordination or domination". This equality among men is the source of "mutual love" among people, which is the foundation of the duties human beings owe each other. For Locke, this perfect liberty and equality does not give people the license of harming the others' "life, health, liberty, or possessions". Locke (1823 [1689]: 141) argues that in the state of liberty,

men have the power to punish the violators of the law of Nature; however, by creating political society men give their natural power to the community in order to secure life, liberty, and property. The aim of the social contract is to preserve and protect natural liberty against any arbitrary use of power. The social contract gives people the right to dismiss any government, which violates the liberties of individual human beings. Consequently, Locke tilts the balance between liberty and security in favor of liberty.

Isaiah Berlin (1958: 7) is a liberal scholar who has argued that liberty and security are distinct values that the relationship needs to be balanced in favor of liberty. According to Berlin, human values are numerous and they are incompatible. To increase any one of human values requires making sacrifices in others. In line with this argument, for him, liberty and security are two values, which are not automatically harmonized with one another. Berlin (1958: 55) argues that we cannot be absolutely free or absolutely secure; therefore, it is needed to balance or make a trade-off between these two values. However, Berlin also argues that it is necessary to preserve a minimum area of liberty in any condition. As a result, it can be argued that according to Berlin (1958), there should be a trade-off between liberty and security in favor of liberty.

In line with the arguments of Locke and Berlin, in the post 9/11 era, the liberal approach to the balance relationship between liberty and security has been opposed to sacrificing liberties in the name of security (Ackerman, 2004; Bovard, 2003; Starr, 2002, Wilkinson, 2011). Scholars who advocate the liberal approach

emphasize that liberty is the ultimate value for state instead of being secondary to security. According to the liberal approach, throughout history in times of war, civil rights and liberties have been restricted until the war ends (Starr, 2007). Similarly, in the context of the war on terror, governments have sacrificed liberty in the name of security. However, from the perspective of the liberal approach, the state is responsible for the protection of liberty; therefore, the state must function without derogating liberty even in times of war. This perspective is in favor of a minimal state and argues that liberty is the core value that legitimizes and strengthens the power of state. As a result, for this approach, liberty is the most important value, restriction of which is unacceptable. For example, Ackerman (2004: 1030) states that "no matter how large the event, no matter how great the ensuing panic, we must insist on the strict protection of all rights all the time". As a result, according to the liberal approach, a life with restricted liberty is not worth living.

Robert Keohane (2004), a neo-liberal scholar, also criticizes security practices adopted by liberal states in the post 9/11 era. He argues that security practices and policies of liberal states should not be oppressive to people. He states that governments should not adopt security practices that challenge with the basic principles of liberalism. According to Keohane, oppressive practices of liberal states serve the interests of terrorist organizations. Keohane asserts that states need to adopt liberal policies and practices under the context of the war on terror.

As it can be understood from the brief summary of the literature concerning the relationship between security and liberty, both conservatives like Hobbes and

liberals like Locke advocate the idea that a balance between security and liberty should be established. The conservative approach prioritizes security while the liberal approach prioritizes liberty. However, these traditional approaches do not provide necessary theoretical framework in order to examine the implications of counter-terrorism measures of liberal states for referents other than the state in a holistic manner in the post 9/11 era. This is because they cannot go beyond the understanding of a trade-off between liberty and security. The conservative approach is entrapped in the search for how much liberty needs to be sacrificed in the name of security. The liberal approach is entrapped in the search for liberty at the expense of security.

Two critical approaches seek to go beyond the balance argument of the traditional approaches. These critical approaches are the Aberystwyth School (Alker, 2005: Booth, 1991a; Booth, 2005; Linklater, 2002; McDonald, 2007; Wheeler, 1996; Wyn Jones, 1995) and the Paris School (Balzacq et al., 2010: Bigo, 2006a; Bigo, 2006b; Bonelli, 2008; Guild, 2003; Tsoukala, 2008; Jabri, 2006; Salter, 2010; Wright, 2010). According to these critical approaches, the relationship between liberty and security need not to be seen in balance terms. These critical approaches see no tension between security and liberty. From these critical approaches' point of view, liberty and security should not be viewed as mutually exclusive but as complementary to each other.

Although the Aberystwyth School does not directly analyze the liberty/security relationship, it goes beyond the balancing argument through its

holistic security understanding. The Aberystwyth School equates security with the achievement of emancipation, which means "freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints" (Booth, 1991: 319). From the perspective of this School if there is oppression, it cannot be said that emancipation is achieved (Booth, 2007: 113). Restrictions in liberty constitute a kind of oppression on individuals and groups. By pointing to a new security understanding, the Aberystwyth School goes beyond the argument of balancing liberty and security as distinct values. In this way, the Aberystwyth School examines the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents in the context of the war on terror.

On the other hand, the Paris School directly analyses the liberty/security relationship and focuses on the security practices of liberal states in the post 9/11 era and their implications for non-state referents. Like the Aberystwyth School, the Paris School is opposed to the idea of striking a balance between security and liberty. Didier Bigo (2006a), one of the most prominent scholars of Paris School, finds the argument of striking a balance between liberty and security as distorted. This is because, for him, there are several ways to conceptualize the relationship between security and liberty. Bigo (2006a) argues that depending on the values shared in a society, security has sometimes positive and sometimes negative connotation for liberty. For Bigo (2006a), governments cannot justify the curtailment of freedoms of people in the name of security. This is because security is not the first right to freedom, even security is not a right.

While literature on both approaches has grown in recent years, previously there has not been any study examining this issue in a comparative manner by bringing in the perspectives of Aberystwyth and Paris Schools. This thesis looks at the liberty/security relationship in the context of the war on terror by comparing the perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School.

In this thesis, the context of the war on terror is chosen since the debate on the relationship between liberty and security has received a new lease of life after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Also, the war on terror has played a crucial role in defining states' security practices in the post 9/11 era. As a result of the interpretation of the 9/11 terrorist attacks as an exceptional threat, liberal states have implemented new counter-terrorism measures that have implications for non-state referents.

1.2 Research Question, Key Concepts and Preliminary Argument

This thesis tries to answer the following question: What are the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than states in the context of the war on terror? I answer this question by bringing in the perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School in a comparative manner.

In order to answer the research question of the thesis, it is necessary to define several key concepts, namely: security, liberal state, and illiberal practice.

There is no single conception of security in the security studies literature. There is a debate on the nature and meaning of security (Krause & Williams, 1996; Terriff et al., 1999). As opposed to the traditional approach to security, critical security studies refer to very different understandings of security (Dunne & Wheeler, 2004: 9). The traditional approach to security rests on varieties of realist theory. Security is defined by Walter Lippmann in 1943 as "[a] nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war" (cited in Dunne & Wheeler, 2004: 11). According to the security definition of Lippmann, the referent object of security is state. From a neorealist perspective of security, the state is privileged as the focus of interest in security. According to neoealist Walt (1991: 212-213), military threats are not the only source of national insecurity. In line with this understanding, Walt emphasizes the military threats, phenomenon of war, and statecraft, such as diplomacy and crisis management. Lastly, Walt is opposed to the broadening of the security agenda since, for him, this broadening of the agenda would diminish intellectual cohesion (Walt, 1991).

The Aberystwyth School reconceptualizes security beyond "its nationalist and statist orthodoxies" (Booth, 2007: 2), and equates security with emancipation whose goal is to deal with oppressions (Booth & Vale, 1997; Booth, 2007: 111). The School also focuses on the individual as the main referent object of security (Booth, 1991). For the Aberystwyth School, the meaning of security comes from the necessity of protecting human values and states are just means for this need (Booth, 2007: 228). From the perspective of this approach, security is an instrumental value and has a

meaning beyond survival. The understanding of security as an instrumental value implies "freedom from life-determining conditions" (Booth, 2007: 102, 107).

From the perspective of the Paris School, (in)security emerges as a result of (in)securitization processes which involve speech acts and practices of security professionals (Bigo, 2008). This approach has criticized the security understanding that only focuses on the international realm and is limited with survival. Security does not mean "avoiding an unwilling form of death" but security means "management of life and its social and structural conditions" (Bigo, 2008: 123). As opposed to the traditional understanding of security as freedom from fear and threat, security has been conceptualized as unease and risk (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008). Moreover, according to this School, security has neither a positive connotation nor a negative connotation. Security is also not a right, from the perspective of the Paris School (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008). The Paris School focuses on civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion in the context on the war on terror.

As a result, both the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School goes beyond the traditional understanding of security. Both Schools define security away from its militarist and statist orthodoxies. Both Schools understand security beyond survival and focus on non-state referents.

This thesis adopts a critical conception of security due to the limits of the traditional understanding of security in reflecting and proposing solutions to insecurities world faces (Bilgin, 2010: 72). The thesis argues for a critical approach

to security that places non-state referents at the center in a way that reflects the indivisibility of security and liberty. Also, unlike the traditional approach to the security, the critical conception of security argues that insecurity is not only related with military threats but also related with non-military issues (Bilgin, 2010: 72). The thesis also conceives security in a holistic manner as offered by the critical conceptions of security. According to this holistic security understanding, insecurity at one level results in insecurity at all levels (Dunne & Wheeler, 2004: 20).

The second key concept which is focused on the thesis is liberal state. A liberal state is expected to respect the core values of liberalism. Individual and liberty are at the core of liberalism. Individual liberty, private property, the division of powers, political participation, and equality of opportunity constitute the core of liberalism (Doyle, 1986: 1151). At the very base of the liberal state are liberal ideas and liberal principles. Liberal ideas that are shared and promoted by liberal states include tolerance and acceptance of diversity (Starr, 2007: 3). Shared liberal principles are other important definitive characteristics of liberal states. The most basic principle shared by liberal states is the equal right to freedom, which includes civil liberties and rights, freedom from arbitrary power, and political participation (Doyle, 1986: 1151, 1152; Starr, 2007: 4). Liberal states are responsible for guaranteeing the equal right to freedom by providing equal legal and political rights to citizens without privileges based on sex, race, class, and religion (Galston, 1991: 11; Starr, 2007: 4; Wilkinson, 1986: 6). Put differently, liberal states have the responsibility to protect individual rights and liberties without making discrimination among its citizens. This is because there is a belief in human reason and moral

responsibility in the liberal tradition. Another shared principle of liberal states, which is at the base of liberal state system is the rule of law (Starr, 2007: 21). Civil rights and liberties are protected with constitutional arrangements in liberal states (Wilkinson, 1986: 7). Constitutional arrangements guarantee the protection of individual against the excessive power of the executive (Jabri, 2006: 56). Constitutionalism in liberal states guarantees independent judiciaries, the control of the representative assembly over the executive, and accountability of representative assembly towards people (Galston, 1991: 4; Jabri, 2006: 49; Wilkinson, 1986: 16-17).

This thesis focuses on liberal states because their security practices in the post 9/11 period brought a new lease of life to the debate on the liberty/security relationship in the security literature. Also because non-liberal states do not have a dilemma. They favour security. In the post 9/11 period, liberal states have argued that there is a need of striking a new balance between liberty and security in favor of security as a response to the threat of terrorism. In line with this understanding, most of the liberal states have implemented security practices that are in tension with the basic liberal ideas and principles of liberalism. In the name of seeking security against terrorism threat, liberal states such as the UK, the US and Australia have sacrificed from the basic principles of liberalism which are expected to be protected and respected by liberal states. Certain core civil rights and liberties have been violated by liberal states in the context of the war on terror. These illiberal security practices of liberal states have increased interest in the debate on liberty/security relationship in the security literature.

Illiberal security practice is the third key concept of this thesis. For this purpose, the concept of "illiberal" needs to be defined. This concept is offered by the Paris School. The understanding that preservation of our freedom requires the practices that involve encroachment on others' freedom is represented by Foucault as "the tendency of liberalism at its limits or as illiberalism" (Foucault, cited in Bigo, 2006a: 42). According to Bigo (2006a: 42), the arguments that security is the first liberty, and that collective security, that is, state security means individual safety constitute the foundations of illiberalism. In other words, the understanding that prioritizes security as the first liberty and links safety of the individual to state security constitutes the foundation of illiberalism (Bigo, 2006a: 42). Based on this definition, this thesis refers as illiberal practice to all kinds of legislation and security practice of states that violate individual rights and liberties by prioritizing security over individual rights and liberties. Illiberal practices adopted and applied by liberal states under the context of war on terrorism include extra-judicial and indefinite detention, deportation, incarceration without due process, extra-ordinary rendition, torture, interception of private communications, disproportionate empowerment of executive powers, extended powers of agencies responsible for law enforcement, restrictions on refugees, their confinement in camps and detention centers, new practices and technologies of border controls (Aradau, 2008: 293; Huysmans & Buonfino, 2008: 771; Jabri, 2006: 51; Tsoukala, 2006: 607).

Building on these definitions, the thesis argues that from the perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School, illiberal security practices of liberal states have created further insecurity for non-state referents in the context of the war

on terror. From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, illiberal security practices of liberal states have created insecurities for individuals in the post 9/11 period. By going beyond the balancing argument, the Aberystwyth School has focused on security considerations of Muslim citizens and non-citizens of liberal states in the context of the war on terror. These individuals' basic rights and liberties have been violated by liberal states in the name of security and they have been subjected to social exclusion, argues the Aberystwyth School. From the perspective of the Paris School, illiberal security practices of liberal states have created danger, unease and risk for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers and social cohesion. By going beyond the balancing argument, the Paris School focuses on sacrifices made from civil liberties, restrictions in immigration and asylum policies and practices led to social disintegration by liberal states as its main concerns in the post 9/11 period.

To analyze the above-mentioned research question, this thesis will review the theoretical perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School on this subject. It will then analyze this question through a case study on the UK as a liberal state. The UK case in the context of the war on terror will be examined by comparing the perspectives of the Aberystwyth and Paris Schools. The UK is chosen as a case since it constitutes a good example of the persistence of the need for re/considering the relationship between security and liberty. In answering this research question from the perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School, the thesis goes beyond the commonly accepted idea of the need for seeking a balance or trade-off between security and liberty.

Conducting an analysis on this research question and finding the preliminary answer stated above have three implications. First, by answering the above research question through bringing in the Aberystwyth and Paris Schools in a comparative manner, this thesis will examine critical perspectives in contrast to the traditional approaches that favor seeking a balance between security and liberty. Second, by showing that the illiberal security practices of liberal states have created further insecurity for non-state referents, this thesis will highlight the need for going beyond the balance argument of the security/liberty relationship. Last, the answer to the research question will show the importance of going beyond the balance argument, in terms of its implications for broader debates on the relationship between liberty and security.

1.3 Structure

Chapter 2 will look at the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than the state from the theoretical perspective of the Aberystwyth School. The first part of the chapter will examine the security conception of the Aberystwyth School. The following part will look at the implications of illiberal security practices for individual security in the context of the war on terror from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School. The reason of focusing on individual security is that according to the Aberystwyth School, the main referent object of security is individual because states are only the means of security, but not the ends (Booth, 1991: 320). The last part of Chapter 2 will seek to answer

the question how to overcome the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents by looking at Aberystwyth School's focus on emancipation, negotiation, dialogue, and equality. In this way, this chapter will try to bring in a detailed overview of the Aberystwyth School on the relationship between security and liberty.

Chapter 3 will look at the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than the state from the theoretical perspective of the Paris School. The first part of the chapter will provide an overview of the security conception of the Paris School. The following part of the chapter will look at the implications of illiberal security practices for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers and social cohesion in the context of the war on terror from the perspective of the Paris School. By going beyond the balancing argument of the liberty/security relationship, the Paris School focuses on these non-state referents. The last part of Chapter 3 will seek to answer the question how to overcome the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents from the perspective of the Paris School. In this way, this chapter will try to bring in a detailed overview of the Paris School on the relationship between security and liberty.

In light of these theoretical perspectives, Chapter 4 will examine the implications of illiberal security practices of the United Kingdom (UK) for non-state referents in the context of the war on terror. This chapter will briefly look at the amendments in the UK law and new legislations related with those illiberal practices of security professionals since the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The reason to choose the UK as a case study is that the UK is one of the oldest democratic states in Europe, which

has a long tradition of respecting individual rights and liberties (Tsoukala, 2006: 615). In addition to this liberal tradition of the UK, it has constantly fought against both domestic and international terrorism for almost 60 years (Tsoukala, 2006: 609). Immediately after 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks, the existing anti-terrorism laws were revised and expanded and new laws were enacted (Aradau, 2008: 295; Huysmans & Buonfino, 2008: 769; Jabri, 2006: 52). Accordingly, the UK is a good example of the persistence of the need for re/considering the relationship between security and liberty.

In the light of these three chapters, it will be concluded that both the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School reflect and propose solutions to the insecurities faced by non-state referents in the post 9/11 era by going beyond the balance argument. Although both the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School have different security understandings, both of them go beyond the balance argument of the liberty/security relationship. The Aberystwyth School goes beyond the balance argument through the idea of emancipation and focuses on security consequences of illiberal security practices of liberal states for individuals. On the other hand, the Paris School goes beyond the balance argument through the idea of (in)securitization. Security is neither global nor for all, argues the Paris School. As a result of this understanding, civil liberties, immigration, asylum, and social cohesion constitute the main concern for the Paris School in the post 9/11 era.

CHAPTER 2

ILLIBERAL SECURITY PRACTICES OF LIBERAL STATES IN THE POST 9/11 ERA FROM THE ABERYSTWYTH SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE

2.1 Introduction

The main objective of Chapter 2 is to examine the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than the state from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School. The first part of this chapter looks at the Aberystwyth School. This part presents an overview of the Aberystwyth School's conceptualization of security, its focus on individual as the primary referent object of security, and its discussion on means and ends of security. The second part of Chapter 2 focuses on the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than states from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School. This second part looks at the Aberystwyth School's focus on the "most vulnerable" as the security referent. The last part of the chapter seeks to answer the question of how to overcome the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for

non-state referents by looking at Aberystwyth School's focus on true emancipation as human equality and non-dualistic thinking.

2.2 What is Security for the Aberystwyth School?

This part of Chapter 2 presents an assessment of security understanding of the Aberystwyth School with the aim of showing how the Aberystwyth School goes beyond the argument of the need to strike a balance between liberty and security. The Aberystwyth School considers security as a derivative concept and reconceptualizes security away from militarist and statist orthodoxies. The Aberystwyth School points to the need for a broadened and deepened understanding of security. Rather than states, individuals are focused on as the primary referent by the Aberystwyth School. Security as a positive value is equated with emancipation by this School. For true emancipation, this School emphasizes non-dualistic logic of means and ends.

2.2.1 Security as a Derivative Concept

The Aberystwyth School criticizes the "reality" of world affairs described as real, out there, and objective by the traditional approaches to security (Booth, 1997: 97). As opposed to the objective understanding of security that requires protection from real pre-given threats, from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, security does not have an objective meaning. Rather, this school "seeks to provide deeper

understandings of oppressive attitudes and behavior" (Booth, 2007: 30). From the perspective of this School, security is created intersubjectively, and it is "an epiphenomenon of contending political philosophies" (Booth & Vale, 1997: 332). According to Booth (1994a: 15-16), dependent on different worldviews and different discourses, security gains different meanings. Different underlying political theories deliver different security conceptions (Booth, 2007: 161). From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, security is therefore a derivative concept. One's understanding of security derives from his/her political views. At the base of different security conceptions lie diverse political theories (Smith, 2005: 27-28). According to the Aberystwyth School, our understanding of world order is central to our security conception. For instance, primary referent object of security, threats to security, and methods to achieve security are understood differently by a Marxist, a racist, a feminist, or whoever depending on their underlying political theories (Booth, 2005b: 21). It follows from this argument that security is not outside of politics but a mode of conduct at the heart of politics. For the Aberystwyth School, security is not before politics but "an intrinsic value within politics" (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 154).

2.2.2 Deepening and Broadening of Security

According to the Aberystwyth School, security can be broadened to the extent that the assumptions of its underlying theory allow (Booth, 2007: 161). The Aberystwyth School points to a broadened security understanding by challenging the traditional conceptions of security that focus on military power and state. The School re-

conceptualizes security away from militarist and statist orthodoxies (Booth, 2007: 2; Booth & Vale, 1997: 332; Wyn Jones, 1995: 309-310). The Aberystwyth School re-conceptualizes security in a holistic manner and in non-statist terms.

Booth (1991a: 317) argues that broadening of the security agenda is necessary. For him, it is apparent that there are problems related with traditional narrow security understandings that focus on the military aspect. This narrow military focus has resulted in "higher levels of destructive power" (Booth, 1991b: 317). Traditional narrow understanding of security does not include the security threats faced daily by most societies and most individuals. Military threats to territorial unity of states are still among the threats to the security of individuals and nations. However, there are other challenges apart from territorial threats to individuals' lives and wellbeing. Most of the threats to individual security and national interests are not posed by military power of other states but come from environmental degradation, economic collapse, ethnic strife, disease, poverty, political oppression, human rights abuses, and crime. These issues are also prominent threats to the lives and wellbeing of most individuals (Booth, 1991b: 318; Wyn Jones, 1995: 309-310).

In addition to the re-conceptualization of security away from militarist orthodoxies, the Aberystwyth School opens up the statist orthodoxies through pointing to an expanded concept of security beyond state survival. The Aberystwyth School argues for the conceptual broadening of security to include "the improvements of the lives of individuals and groups" by going beyond mere defense

of state sovereignty (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 161). Security understanding needs to go beyond "the techniques of state survival", argues Booth (2007: 39). Survival is crucial and required since it is synonymous with the continuation of the existence of state. However, survival of state does not mean security for individual human beings. This is because survival of state does not imply "living tolerably well, and less still with having the conditions to pursue cherished political and social ambitions" for individuals (Booth, 2007: 102). As a result, security, beyond merely state survival, means "survival plus" implying that there is a purpose of "creating space for human self-invention beyond merely existing" (Booth, 2007: 39). Security plus is equated with creating space to develop fully as human being. For instance, it cannot be argued that a woman who lives in extreme poverty does have security. This is because the woman is deprived of basic human requirements such as nutrients and water (Booth, 2007: 103). Similarly, from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, refugees living in long-term camps in war-torn parts of the world do not have security (Booth, 2005a: 2). Therefore, from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, freedom from life-determining conditions is crucial in order to open space for human beings to make choices and develop as a full human being.

It follows from this argument that security refers to "positive conditions of living" as opposed to the mere state survival, according to the Aberystwyth School, (Booth, 2007: 108). For the Aberystwyth School, security is invaluable for human societies and needs to be understood as a positive value. This is because security is conceptualized as freedom from insecurities that determines the lives of individuals (Booth, 2008: 77). From this perspective, protecting human values through

preventing life-determining insecurities and creating space for "life-enhancing possibilities" lie at the base of security as an instrumental value (Booth, 2007: 108, 228). Security is understood as opening up space for different life choices and chances for individuals. Security, in other words, is synonymous with having the possibility to choose the life any individual wants to live (Booth, 2005b: 22-23).

2.2.3 Security and Emancipation

Based on the understanding of security as a positive and an instrumental value, security is understood as emancipation by the Aberystwyth School. From the perspective of this school, emancipation should be at the heart of the security thinking. Emancipation and security are considered as "two sides of the same coin", which refers to "the invention of humanity" (Booth, 1991b: 319). According to the Aberystwyth School, security is only possible to the extent that emancipatory politics overwhelm oppressions in world (Booth, 2007: 114).

The word emancipation comes from the Latin word *emancipare*, meaning "the action of setting free from slavery and tutelage" (Wyn Jones, 2005: 216). Struggles against monarchical oppressions, inequalities, and religious intolerance have played an important role in shaping the emancipation concept. Struggles for freedom from oppressions in modern history, such as struggles of serfs in Russia, and of the Irish in the British state, have been associated with the word of emancipation (Booth, 2007: 111). In the Aberystwyth School, emancipation is more fully defined

as “the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they freely choose to do” (Booth, 1991b: 319). This understanding of emancipation means to struggle against oppression and to struggle for a society whose central values are liberty, equality, justice, human development and progress (Booth, 2007: 111). Emancipation involves the expansion of human potentiality. Enhancing the possibility for “human realization” constitutes core of the emancipation (Booth, 1999: 41).

Booth (1999: 41) begins by explaining what emancipation is not, toward fully accounting for the Aberystwyth School’s understanding of emancipation. From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, emancipation is not an end-point but a process. Emancipation is not a fixed idea about a better future world order. Emancipation is not a blueprint for a better end-point in the history of human beings but it is “a direction rather than a destination” (Wyn Jones, 2005: 230; Booth, 1999: 41). Since a notion of process is central to emancipation, the project of emancipation is not something that is completed at some end point. Even if a more emancipated order is achieved compared to the previous one, there is always possibility to achieve a further emancipated order (Wyn Jones, 2005: 230).

From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, emancipation should be based on “concrete utopias”, which are related with the potentialities in the existing order (Wyn Jones, 1999: 57). It is argued that there already exists a potential of emancipation in the prevailing order that is not fulfilled yet. The status quo should be

criticized not through providing a detailed plan for an ideal society, but "through a form of *immanent* critique" (Wyn Jones, 2005: 220).

Second, from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, emancipation cannot be at the expense of others but it is only realizable together with others. The statement that "I cannot be emancipated until you are" is central to true emancipation, argues Booth (1999: 42). Embracing other people is crucial for true emancipation, from the Aberystwyth School point of view (Booth, 1999: 65). All humanity needs to move in the direction of emancipation. This means that all humanity needs to move "towards human flourishing and away from oppression" (Booth, 1999:42). All human beings should progress away from oppression in line with full human realization (Booth, 1999: 42).

Finally, for the Aberystwyth School, emancipation is not synonymous with Westernization. Emancipation may include some of the Western ideas. However, it cannot be argued that Western ideas are the best of all possible better visions of a new society. According to this School, it is in the spirit of true emancipation that "there are no final answers and that nobody has a monopoly of ultimate truth" (Booth, 1999: 42).

From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, true understanding of emancipation has three roles. First, emancipation plays the role of a philosophical anchorage (Booth, 2005d: 182). In the social world, there is no objective ultimate truth but there is a pragmatic truth, which is created intersubjectively. Emancipation

provides the basis for pragmatic truth claims. Emancipation plays a crucial role in deciding whether to take any truth claim seriously or not (Booth, 1999: 43). Second, emancipation as a strategic process requires "benign and reformist steps" which aim at creating a better world order (Booth, 1999: 43-44). Lastly, emancipation as a tactical goal is related with praxis. From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, theories do not only explain the world but also shape the world that they seek to explain (Bilgin, 2008: 96). According to this School, theories constitute the "reality" by "informing our practices" (Bilgin, 1999: 33). While legitimizing some practices, theories marginalize certain other practices through organizing knowledge. Certain practices are adopted and applied on the grounds of underlying theory's assumptions and norms (Bilgin, 1999: 33). This means "theory can give direction to action" (Wyn Jones, 2005: 229). Based on this understanding, from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, one of the aims of the theory committed to emancipation is to delineate the means and ends of security. There is a variety of means and ends in the long run and in the short run. Emancipation shows a way to choose between certain means and ends (Wyn Jones, 2005: 229).

2.2.4 Individual as the Main Referent of Security

From the Aberystwyth School point of view, focus on emancipation as the main value results in taking individual as the primary referent object of security. This is because emancipation is central to the well-being of individuals (Booth & Vale, 1997: 337). For this school, the idea that individuals should be the end of security is

implicit in emancipation. Individuals' security should come first, according to the Aberystwyth School (Booth, 1991d: 539). Booth argues that the idea that individuals should be the ultimate referent object of security has also been upheld by Hedley Bull. In *The Anarchical Society*, Bull argues that "the ultimate units of the great society of all mankind are not states … but individual human beings, which are permanent and indestructible in a sense in which groupings of them of this of that sort are not" (Bull cited in Booth, 1991b: 319). Based on this thinking, states should not be treated as the primary referent object of security. States should not be considered as ends but as means. According to the Aberystwyth School, to focus on states as the ends for security prevents the development of a comprehensive theory of security on world scale. This is because it is unreliable and illogical to treat states as the primary referent for security (Booth, 1991b: 320).

From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, states are unreliable since they do not always serve the "business of security", argues Booth (1991a: 320). States may cause insecurities for individuals and may not provide for the needs of individuals. Most of the time, states prioritize their own security concerns over the security concerns of individuals within state. In most part of the world, states ignore the needs and interests of their citizens. In some cases, states cannot provide order or use oppressive means in order to maintain order (Bilgin et al., 1998: 149; Booth, 1991d: 540). In some cases, states turn into sources of threat rather than being sources of security. Hitler's Germany, Saddam Hussein's Iraq, and daily human rights abuses of states constitute examples to states that fail to provide security to the people living within their boundaries (Booth, 1991b: 320; Wheeler, 1996: 127). The

apartheid regime is South Africa is given as another example of state's constituting threat to the wellbeing of individual human beings. The security of the majority of the population in the South African state was under threat as a result of the security of the apartheid regime (Booth & Vale, 1997: 334). In such cases, states constitute the most important part of insecurity for individuals and not a solution to the problem of insecurity. As it is seen from these cases, the security of state does not always mean the security of individuals since policies and practices of states constitute threat to the well-being of people living in states. It is the own state which creates insecurity for individuals in the most part of the world (Wyn Jones, 1995: 310; Booth, 1997: 93).

According to Booth (1991a: 320), it is illogical to think of states as the primary referents of security although states can be the main agent in providing for security. Aberystwyth School scholars use the mother-baby analogy to illustrate this point. Although mother has the main agency in terms of providing security for her child, she is not "the primary referent in a normative sense" (Bilgin et al., 1998: 150; Booth, 2007: 195). Mother's power is overwhelmed by the needs of the baby. Similarly, the state has the main agency in terms of providing security for individuals living in its territory. However, the state is not the primary referent of security since state's power is overwhelmed by the security needs of individuals, for the Aberystwyth School. It follows that it is illogical to think states as ends even though states produce both internal and external security, argues Booth (2007: 196). In his article "Security and Emancipation", Booth (1991a: 320) uses house analogy in order to show that states, like houses, are means to provide security for people living

within them. The efforts to protect states like houses should not damage the well-being of the people living within them (Booth, 1991b: 320). It follows that although states have agency to provide security, it is illogical to treat states as the primary referent object of security.

Consequently, the Aberystwyth School focuses on the individual, who constitutes humanity as a whole, as the primary referent object of security (Dunne & Wheeler, 2004: 10). From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, individuals' needs and liberties should not be restricted or marginalized in the name of state security (Booth, 1991b: 320; Booth, 1991d). For this School, the needs and interests of states should not lead to marginalization or ignorance of "security concerns of individuals and social groups" (Job cited in Bilgin, 2003: 210-211). In line with its focus on individual security, from the Aberystwyth School perspective, theory is for the ones who are "the voiceless, the unrepresented, the powerless". Therefore, the Aberystwyth School calls for focusing on the needs and concerns of the "most vulnerable" as opposed to the security concerns of state. (Said cited in Wyn Jones, 1995: 311). The purpose of the Aberystwyth School is to emancipate those "most vulnerable" individuals (Bilgin et al., 1998: 155).

2.2.5 Non-Dualistic Logic of Means and Ends

From the Aberystwyth School point of view, emancipation of those most vulnerable individuals is possible only if the means used would be consistent with the ideal of

freeing of human beings from all kinds of constraints, argues Linklater (2002: 303). The ideal of creating space for human self-realization is central to the Aberystwyth School. The practices resorted in order to protect individual human beings should be in line with this ideal (Booth, 2008: 77).

Accordingly, the Aberystwyth School is opposed to instrumental reason that has had a dominant place in world politics (Wyn Jones, 2005: 222). The Aberystwyth School argues that instrumental reason imprisons individuals "by turning everything into an object to be subjugated" (Booth, 2007: 253). The logic behind the instrumental reason is that ends justify means. According to this logic, self-righteous ends justify all kinds of means including immoral and violent practices. Instrumental reason separates means and ends. Ends and means are considered as two separate entities when instrumental reason rules. However, from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, to treat ends and means as discrete entities creates problems. This is because instrumental reason may lead decision makers to act independently from moral constraints. Means may create the danger to destroy the ends that are being pursued (Booth, 2007: 253-255).

Adorno and Horkheimer (cited in Booth, 2007: 253-254; Wyn Jones, 1999: 22-23) give the example of Enlightenment philosophy in order to show how means can destroy the very ends sought. They argue that although the aim of Enlightenment philosophy was to liberate people, instrumental reason resulted in totalitarianism. As a result of adopting instrumental reason, people did harm to the nature on which they depended. Therefore, rather than being liberated, human beings have become

"alienated" (Adorno and Horkheimer cited in Booth, 2007: 254). This instance shows the danger of "the dualistic logic of instrumental reason", thinks Booth (2007: 255).

In a similar vein, Wyn Jones (2005: 222) argues that instrumental reason is detrimental to emancipation. This is because it results in inhuman outcomes. Concentration camps are thought as one of the most striking examples of inhuman consequences of instrumental reason (Wyn Jones, 2005: 222). As opposed to inhuman consequences of instrumental reason, in line with Albert Camus's (cited in Booth & Dunne, 2002: 21) statement that "the means one uses today shapes the ends one might perhaps reach tomorrow", for the Aberystwyth School, means and ends should be true to each other (Booth, 2007: 256).

If non-dualistic logic is applied to security and emancipation, the focus shifts to means from ends as the aim, according to the Aberystwyth School (Booth, 1999: 44). This logic is inspired by Gandhi's argument that unlike ends which may be unattainable, means are not distant (Richards, 1991: 31-32). Means which are equivalent to ends are achievable. For example, it might not be possible to reverse climate change immediately but singing treaties is a benign step to change existing consumption patterns (Booth, 2006: 46).

To sum up, security is understood as a derivative concept by the Aberystwyth School. This School reconceptualizes security away from the militarist and statist orthodoxies of the traditional approaches to security. It understands security in a holistic manner. Security is understood by the Aberystwyth School as a positive and

instrumental value that prevents life-determining insecurities. In line with this, security is equated with emancipation by this School. Lastly, as opposed to the instrumental reason that sees means and as distinct, the School focuses on means and ends as morally equivalent.

This part presented an overview of the Aberystwyth School's security understanding, its focus on individual as the main referent object of security, and its emphasis on non-dualistic logic of means/ends. The following part will look at the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents in the context of war on terror from the Aberystwyth School point of view.

2.3 Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of Liberal States for Referents Other than State

With the aim of showing the need for going beyond the balance argument of the relationship between security and liberty, this part examines the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents in the post 9/11 period from the Aberystwyth School perspective. For this purpose, a general perspective of the Aberystwyth School on the liberty and security relationship will be presented. Then, Aberystwyth School's understanding of liberty/security relationship in the context of the war on terror will be looked at through examining the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for individuals as security referents.

The Aberystwyth School does not see the relationship between liberty and security in terms of a need to strike a balance between the two values. On the contrary, the Aberystwyth School sees liberty and security as indivisible moral values. From the Aberystwyth School perspective, violence can be defeated by liberty (Rummel, cited in Booth, 1991b: 323). It is not possible to have more security by restricting liberties even under the threat of terrorism, according to the Aberystwyth School perspective (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 162). This is because emancipation is the central idea to the Aberystwyth School. Through the idea of emancipation, whose one of the central values is liberty, the Aberystwyth School goes beyond the balance argument (Booth, 1991: 321).

After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, liberal states started to employ illiberal security practices increasingly in the name of security from the threat of terrorism. Based on the "paradigm of prevention", some illiberal security practices have been employed by liberal states (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 161-162). On the grounds of security from terrorism threat, illiberal security practices have been justified by liberal states in the post 9/11 period. Such illiberal security practices of liberal states have included practices that are in conflict with the value of liberty (Booth & Dunne, 2002: 8).

According to the Aberystwyth School, because of the dominance of dualistic thinking, the adoption of illiberal security practices has been seen as a solution to the threat of terrorism by liberal states (Booth, 2006: 45). As a result of this dualistic thinking, it is argued by liberal states that exceptional methods are required in order

to fight against terrorism in the post 9/11 period. Dualistic thinking has justified the use of forms of violence including torture against "the other" who poses the threat of terrorism (Linklater, 2007: 111-112). Because of the dualistic thinking, on the grounds of security from terrorism, the rule of law has been violated through some of the counter-terrorism measures and the way they implemented (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 161). The treatment of prisoners in Guantanamo is just one example of the violation of the rule of law in the context of global war on terror (Booth & Dunne, 2002: 21). As a result, following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the question of how to respond to the threat of terrorism came to the fore in security literature. Within the framework of this question, debates in the security literature about the relationship between security and liberty have received a new lease of life. By going beyond the argument of the need to strike a balance between liberty and security, the Aberystwyth School emphasizes the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents of security in the post 9/11 context.

2.3.1 Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of Liberal States for Individual Security

Illiberal security practices adopted by liberal states in the context of the war on terror have created more insecurity for individual human beings than the threat of terrorism, according to the Aberystwyth School. From the perspective of this school, individuals have been frightened because of illiberal security practices of liberal states (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 161-162). For example, because of leading to the non-

observance of the rule of law, some measures such as surveillance systems, expanded police power, security checks and "depriving of individuals of their liberty without charge or adequate information" have made individuals more insecure (Cole & Lobel cited in Booth & Dunne, 2011: 161-162).

From an Aberystwyth School point of view, individuals who are insecure because of the existing practices and policies should be focused on as the referent object of security. In the context of the global war on terror, the "most vulnerable" refers to those who are directly or indirectly affected by counter-terrorism measures of states (McDonald, 2007: 257). From this School's perspective, victims of counter-terrorism measures include Muslim citizens who are constructed as the other and the individuals who are non-citizens. This is because in liberal states, there has been such a suspicion that the threat of terrorism may come from both the "home-grown varieties" and non-citizens (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 163).

According to the Aberystwyth School, the suspicion that the threat of terrorism has been coming from a small number of outlawed individuals who belong to "the Islamic community" has led to a communitarian categorization of Muslim citizens of liberal states (Appleby, 2010: 421). Communitarian categorization means classifying people under a certain criterion such as religion and class by ignoring the fact that individuals can belong to multiple communities at the same time. Under the communitarian categorization, all other identity characteristics such as political views, age, sex, class, history, and environment have been ignored and reduced into just one criterion.

In the context of the global war on terror, Muslims are categorized just by their religious beliefs ignoring their other identity characteristics. Religion has been thought as the most decisive element of identity. The identity of individual human beings has been reduced into their religious beliefs. As a result, a single identity characteristic has been imposed on a segment of people who worships according to Islam. In the context of the war on terror, all Muslims have been put into one community, named as "the Islamic community" (Appleby, 2010: 421; Booth & Dunne, 2011: 115).

From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, as a result of communitarian categorization, Muslim people have been constructed as the other in liberal states and faced with social exclusion. Communitarian categorization has resulted in new social divisions and alienation of individuals categorized under "the Islamic community" from the rest of the society (Appleby, 2010: 421-422, 432; Booth, 2007: 357). For the Aberystwyth School, because of the constructed link between Islam and terrorism, "the Islamic community" has been seen as the potential "enemy within" in liberal states (Jackson, 2007: 405-412).

According to the Aberystwyth School, the evil discourse used for the 9/11 terrorist attacks and perpetrators of these attacks has reinforced this communitarian categorization of Muslim citizens and justified illiberal security practices of liberal states that target "the Islamic community". Terrorists have been dehumanized while terrorist actions have been defined as evil in the discourses adopted by liberal states. The war against terrorism has been characterized as the war against the evil (Booth

& Dunne, 2011: 62-65). Through demonization, terrorists have been seen as irrational, violent, fanatic, and savage beings (Jackson, 2007: 421). As a consequence of the demonization of terrorists and establishment of a link between terrorism and Islam, xenophobia and racism against Muslims has increased (Linklater, 2002b: 306).

For the Aberystwyth School, another result of dehumanization is to justify inhuman treatment of the constructed other (Booth, 1995: 108). If the agents of terrorism are characterized in inhuman terms, then it becomes easier to adopt severe measures against terrorism (Parekh, 2002: 271). From the perspective of some Aberystwyth School scholars (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 66; Linklater, 2002b: 303) as a corollary of representations of terrorists as evil, extreme counter-terrorism measures targeting Muslim citizens have been normalized and legitimized. The adoption of illiberal security practices that violate civil liberties and the rule of law has been sanctioned through the dehumanization of terrorists in the context of the global war on terror (Booth, 2008: 75).

From an Aberystwyth School point of view, the construction of individuals who are supposed to belong to "the Islamic community" as the other and the use of such evil discourse have resulted in the rejection of these individuals' certain rights. Based on the argument that these individuals who can pose a threat to the security of the state cannot have the same rights as other citizens of the state, illiberal security practices targeting "the Muslim community" have been adopted by liberal states in the post 9/11 period (Appleby, 2010: 433). It follows that in the context of the war on

terror, through the communitarian categorization and the use of evil discourse, states have created insecurities for individual human beings who are constructed as the other. This is because communitarian categorization of Muslim citizens and the use of evil discourse serve to legitimize certain counter-terrorism practices against certain groups of people. According to the Aberystwyth School, the communitarian categorization of Muslim citizens has turned all individuals who are categorized under "the Islamic community" to targets for illiberal practices (Appleby, 2010: 423; Booth & Dunne, 2011: 115).

The Aberystwyth School is opposed to the evil discourse, communitarian categorization of individuals, and the establishment of a link between terrorism and Islam. It is argued that Muslims believe and worship differently from believers of other religions. However, this difference does not mean that Muslims resort to terrorist acts easily in any situation. Like all other individuals, Muslims do not prefer to employ terrorist acts easily under any condition (Booth, 2011: 123).

Other victims of counter-terrorism measures include individuals who are non-citizens. Non-citizens include immigrants and "rightless" people who have neither a home state they can return to nor legal rights (Oriola, 2009: 266). The membership of a political community is central for the security of individuals since political communities provide special rights and consideration for their full members (Linklater, 2002a: 135). The absence of rights and security in the case of non-citizens points to the centrality of political community for the security of individuals (Linklater, 2005: 113). According to the Aberystwyth School, although political

community is at the center of security, it may turn into an institution of oppression for non-citizens. This is because there is a demarcating line between citizens and non-citizens (Booth, 2007: 268). In line with this argument, non-citizens' rights and liberties might be under threat even in liberal states whose constitution is based on the respect for individual rights and liberties (Oriola, 2009: 257-258). Therefore, from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, it is necessary to focus on non-citizens as referent objects since they are among the most vulnerable in the context of the war on terror.

In the post 9/11 period some counter-terrorism measures have also targeted non-citizens through making a distinction between the rights of citizens and human rights. In line with this distinction, some basic rights and liberties of non-citizens have been denied in the context of the global war on terror. According to liberal states, in the fight against terrorism to deny some rights of non-citizens has become possible since they are not full members of the political community. In the context of the war on terror, the denied rights of non-citizens include some basic rights such as "the right to know the case against you, to have a fair hearing in order to defend yourself, the right to the dignity of the human person" (Oriola, 2009: 266). In this context, illiberal security practices of liberal states constitute security threat for non-citizens who do not enjoy the rights and liberties that full members enjoy (Linklater, 2005: 116).

The Aberystwyth School is opposed to the distinction made between citizens and non-citizens. This is because from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School

unless all individuals become full members of political community, it is not possible to achieve emancipation (Booth, 2007: 270). According to the Aberystwyth School, an emancipatory political community should not be based on morally irrelevant differences among individuals such as citizens and non-citizens (Linklater, 2005: 120). All human beings are equal and deserve equal respect whether they become full members of a political community or not. The rights and liberties of all individual human beings including citizens and non-citizens should be protected and respected equally (Oriola, 2009: 135).

According to the assumption of equality of all human beings states, both in their domestic and foreign policies, should respect the principle of "not to harm" outsiders (Linklater, 2002: 135). An emancipatory political community should rest on the "not to harm" principle which aims at protecting individual human beings everywhere from unnecessary suffering (Linklater, 2001: 261-262). Based on this understanding, it is central to an emancipatory political community to protect all individual human beings from unnecessary suffering and harm regardless of their citizenship (Linklater, 2002: 144, 150). This is because it is not possible to have more security by harming other individual human beings. In line with the principle of "not to harm" and understanding of equality of all human beings, from the Aberystwyth School perspective, exclusivist understanding of citizens and non-citizens should be shifted to the "cosmopolitan 'we the peoples'" understanding in an emancipatory political community (Dunne & Wheeler, 2004: 10). Rather than making a distinction between citizens and non-citizens, an emancipatory political community requires "a sense of loyalty and moral obligation" (Booth, 1991d: 540).

Solidarity with foreigners whether they are outside or inside is central to an emancipatory political community, for the Aberystwyth School (Booth, 2007: 142).

To sum up, this part of the chapter focused on the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents from an Aberystwyth School perspective. In the context of the war on terror, the Aberystwyth School focuses on Muslim citizens and non-citizens as the "most vulnerable" that is directly or indirectly affected by illiberal security practices of liberal states. The following part will look at what security practices should be adopted in the post 9/11 period from the Aberystwyth School point of view.

2.4 How to Overcome the Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of Liberal States for Non-State Referents? The Aberystwyth School Perspective

From an Aberystwyth School point of view, security measures adopted in the post 9/11 period should be in line with "the moral ideal of freeing all human beings from unnecessary suffering" (Linklater, 2002: 303). This is because security is only possible to the extent that oppressions of individual human beings are overcome (Booth, 2007: 114). Inventing an emancipatory world order is a priority for the Aberystwyth School (Bilgin et al., 1998: 156). If there is any kind of oppression, it cannot be said that there is emancipation (Booth, 2007: 113). From an Aberystwyth School perspective, in line with the idea of emancipation, it can be argued that

illiberal security practices of liberal states in the context of the global war on terror have not produced more security for individuals since these practices have targeted specific groups of individuals by violating their individual rights and liberties. As opposed to illiberal security practices to fight against terrorism, the Aberystwyth School emphasizes the importance of emancipation for the well-being of all individuals.

For the Aberystwyth School, human equality is crucial for emancipation. According to the Aberystwyth School, human equality refers to human capabilities, such as health, education, economic wellbeing, political participation, and freedom of movement. These human capabilities provide "the freedoms by which people can actually enjoy to choose the lives they have reason to value" (Booth, 2007: 351). Liberty is the central value of emancipation. The value of liberty advocated by the Aberystwyth School is an egalitarian concept of liberty (Booth, 1991b: 321-322). Liberty is not possible without equality. This means "liberty is conditional on equality" (Booth, 2007: 648). Therefore, for the Aberystwyth School, all individual human beings should be treated equally. Human equality should be emphasized rather than celebrating differences such as race, nationality or gender (Booth, 2007: 140). Consequently, in line with the human equality argument, for the Aberystwyth School, true emancipation is not possible against others but with them. Emancipation implies reciprocity of rights. The idea that "I am not truly free until everyone is free" is at the core of emancipation. The Aberystwyth School's emancipation understanding depends on the belief that "my freedom depends on your freedom" (Booth, 1991b: 322). It follows that the aim of the Aberystwyth School is to create

space for human self-realization not against others but with the rest of the humanity (Booth, 2007: 138).

For the Aberystwyth School, the equality of all individual human beings is the bedrock of human security. This is because equality is the basis of all rights and liberties. The Aberystwyth School argues that inequality is not good for the security of individuals because inequality has negative influences on individual lives. From the Aberystwyth School perspective, rather than adopting policies that promote inequality, one way of dealing with human wrongs in world politics is to celebrate human equality. However, it is important to emphasize that the Aberystwyth School understanding of equality does not mean sameness but it requires respecting all individuals' rights and liberties equally (Booth, 2007: 140, 273, 349-350). In line with the equality of all human beings, the Aberystwyth School is opposed to the reification of identities. It is argued that reification of identities inhibits emancipation (Booth, 2007: 221). Accordingly, in the context of the global war on terror, the construction of Muslims as the other through communitarian categorization has been criticized by Aberystwyth School scholars (Booth, 2005c: 109). From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, communitarian categorization creates further constraints for individuals. This is because through communitarian categorization, counter-terrorism measures adopted in the post 9/11 world have targeted Muslims through discriminating them from rest of the society.

As opposed to communitarian categorization of people, the Aberystwyth School emphasizes the importance of emancipatory political community for security.

In an emancipatory community, it is recognized that individuals have multiple identities rather than having one identity. For instance, an individual who believe in Islam may be a feminist or environmentalist simultaneously. In addition to religious identity, individuals have other identities such as political ones. In an emancipatory community, individuals can belong to multiple communities at the same time. From the Aberystwyth School perspective, "emancipatory communities in recognizing the right of individuals to express themselves through multiple identifiers of difference, will, above all, celebrate human equality" (Booth, 2005c: 109).

For the Aberystwyth School, it follows from this human equality argument that, cosmopolitan sensibility is crucial for emancipation. Based on cosmopolitan sensibility, the Aberystwyth School is opposed to the targeting of non-citizens by counter-terrorism measures in the context of the global war on terror. From the Aberystwyth School point of view, all human beings are of equal worth regardless of their origin, race, and nationality. All human beings need to be concerned equally whether they become citizens or not. In an emancipatory order, it is necessary that all individuals including non-citizens have the liberty to act as a full member of the political community. An emancipatory order requires solidarity of all humanity (Booth, 2007: 258, 351).

In addition to human equality, for the Aberystwyth School, true emancipation requires that means and ends should be in accord with each other. As opposed to the adoption of dualistic thinking in the post 9/11 period, it is argued that in order to achieve an emancipatory order, non-dualistic thinking of means and ends should be

adopted (Booth, 2006: 45). According to non-dualistic thinking, the solution of the security problems cannot be violence since means should not be in contradiction with the ends sought. Methods that resort to violence and violate the rule of law lead to a cycle of violence, argues Bhikhu Parekh (2002: 273). In line with this understanding, it is thought that resorting to violence in the context of the global war on terror has produced "a cycle of terrorism and counter-terrorism" (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 7). The Aberystwyth School, based on non-dualistic thinking, has argued that only if means that are morally equivalent to the ends sought are employed, victory over terrorism can be achieved (Booth & Dunne, 2002: 10, 21). Terrorism can be defeated through respecting differences, promoting equality, and treating terrorist suspects and prisoners properly, argues Booth (2006: 46).

In line with non-dualistic thinking, for the Aberystwyth School, dialogue and negotiation should be at the base of security practices as opposed to illiberal security practices (Ruane & Todd, 2005: 238). From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, it is not possible to have an emancipatory community without dialogue (Booth, 2007: 272). According to non-dualistic thinking, in the fight against terrorism, dialogue and negotiation is the moral and the most prudent way.

In the post 9/11 period, there has been a lack of understanding among people. The similarities among people who belong to different ethnicities, cultures, and religions are much more than the differences. Because of this reason, people need to understand each other. For the Aberystwyth School, there is no "clash of civilizations" but misunderstandings and stereotypes among people (Booth & Dunne,

2002: 1-5). Differences among people should be negotiated based on the human equality understanding. Dialogue and negotiation should involve toleration for differences and respect for human rights (Booth & Dunne, 2002: 10). Through dialogue, difference among people would be negotiated. In this way, people would have deepened understanding about the diversity among people. Therefore, mutual understanding and sympathy among people would be enhanced and deepened. Dialogue would help people to understand each other's sensibilities and enhance mutual trust among people while it makes people to criticize themselves (Parekh, 2002: 274).

At the basis of dialogue is human interaction. Human interaction helps go beyond stereotypes and categorization of identity. Because of this abandoning stereotypes and categorization of identity, dialogue would help eradicate labeling some segments of population as the other in the context of global war on terror. Also, it is necessary to focus on needs and interests of all individual human beings who may be affected by dialogue. In this way, concerns of the "most vulnerable" would be taken into account in the context of the global war on terror (Booth, 2007: 359; Booth & Dunne, 2011: 176). Consequently, in the post 9/11 period, dialogue and negotiation would help reach a more emancipatory order for individual human beings (Parekh, 2002: 274).

To sum up, this part looked at the question of how to overcome the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than state from the Aberystwyth School perspective. This part focused on Aberystwyth

School's emphasize on human equality, emancipatory political community, cosmopolitan sensibility, dialogue, and negotiation as security methods in order to deal with implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for the referents other than state in the context of global war on terror.

2.5 Conclusion

The main objective of Chapter 2 was to answer the question of what the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states are for referents other than states in the context of the war on terror from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School. In doing so, this chapter aims to show the need for going beyond the balance argument of the liberty/security relationship. In line with this aim, in this chapter, an assessment of Aberystwyth School's security understanding was presented. The assessment of Aberystwyth School's security understanding showed that through reconceptualizing security in a holistic manner and non-statist terms, the Aberystwyth School goes beyond the zero-sum logics of security that legitimizes violations in individual rights and civil liberties. By going beyond zero-sum understandings of security, the Aberystwyth School focuses on security concerns of the "most vulnerable" in present day world politics, who are Muslim citizens and non-citizens of liberal states in the context of the war on terror. The chapter tried to show that through going beyond the argument of the need to strike a balance between liberty and security, the Aberystwyth School emphasizes human equality,

negotiation, and dialogue in order to overcome security concerns of “most vulnerable” in the post 9/11 world.

CHAPTER 3

ILLIBERAL SECURITY PRACTICES OF LIBERAL STATES IN THE POST 9/11 ERA FROM THE PARIS SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE

3.1 Introduction

The main objective of Chapter 3 is to examine the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than the state in the context of the war on terror from the perspective of the Paris School. This chapter aims to show the need for going beyond the balance argument of the liberty/security relationship. For this purpose, the first part of this chapter looks at the Paris School. This part presents an overview of the Paris School's emphasis on interdisciplinary perspective, its notions of security and insecurity, its understanding of (in)securitization process and its focus on the field of (in)security professionals. The second part of Chapter 3 focuses on the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than states. This second part looks at "ban-opticon dispositif" and the Paris School's focus on civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion as security referents. The last part of the chapter seeks to answer the

question of how to overcome the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents from the perspective of the Paris School.

3.2 What is Security from the Perspective of the Paris School?

This part of Chapter 3 presents an assessment of security understanding of the Paris School with the aim of showing how the Paris School goes beyond the argument of the need to strike a balance between liberty and security. The Paris School rejects the domination of International Relations (IR) in security studies and adopts an interdisciplinary perspective. It questions understandings of security as survival and as a positive value. It advocates a constructivist stance and understands security as the result of an (in)securitization process. From the perspective of the Paris School, an (in)securitization process is not necessarily a result of the decision or strategy of an actor but a result of field effect.

3.2.1 Interdisciplinary Perspective of the Paris School

The Paris School is opposed to the domination of IR on security studies. This is because IR scholars working on security has mostly ignored the contributions of criminologists, sociologists, psychologists on issues of insecurity, crime, and crime control. Security Studies dominated by IR has refused to borrow from the knowledge that has been constructed in other disciplines such as sociology, criminology, cultural

theory, and anthropology (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 1). Security has been understood solely as an international relations problem as it has been disengaged from other disciplines (Balzacq et al., 2010: 1). The Paris School challenges this understanding of security as a sub-discipline of IR by refusing the idea that IR has a monopoly on the meaning of security (Bigo, 2008a: 118).

The Paris School is critical of IR understanding of security as survival that is applied to international realm through making a distinction between internal and international realm. IR scholars have rejected to discuss any meaning of security apart from survival (Bigo, 2008a: 116). From the perspective of the traditional security understanding, security is a "politics of exception" and "beyond politics" (Bigo, 2008a: 122). According to this traditional security understanding, security is about existential things such as survival, war and death but not about daily practices such as the feeling of insecurity, crime, fear of crime, health concerns, and poverty. Such daily concerns are considered as "beyond the scope" of the research agenda of IR dominated security studies. The IR epistemic community has considered issues other than survival associated with international realm as irrelevant. Such issues have been reduced to a "law and order" question. The definition of security studies and of strategic studies has been considered as referring to the same thing (Bigo, 2008a: 118).

The focus of security studies dominated by IR on international realm and its understanding of security as survival has been criticized by the Paris School. For Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala (2008: 1), the dominance of IR in security

studies and its focus on survival and external security has resulted in a fragmented interpretation of security. According to Bigo (2008a: 122), it is not possible to study security exclusively from an IR perspective. The Paris School has an interdisciplinary perspective that brings together scholars from different disciplines such as political sociology, law, IR, and criminology to analyze security. The Paris School is in interaction with scholars in areas largely covered by internal security (C.A.S.E. Collective, 2006: 449).

3.2.2 The Notions of Security and Insecurity

The Paris School questions the understanding of security as survival and as a positive value. According to the Paris School, political aspect of security challenges the security understanding as survival, or protection and reassurance. This is because there are side effects of security practices such as the legitimization of violence and coercion (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 2). From this perspective, politics is at the core of the security conceptualization and security is about legitimacy. For the Paris School, depending on politics and legitimization practices of actors, security gains meaning. From the perspective of the Paris School, the definition of security and insecurity is the political struggle among actors who are capable of declaring with an amount of authority who needs to be protected, who can be sacrificed, who is the referent object of violence and coercion (Bigo, 2008a: 123).

From Paris School's perspective, "the knowledge of who needs to survive, be protected and from what, also supposes knowing who is sacrificed in this operation" (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 2). Therefore, sacrifice is at the center of security. According to the Paris School, at the center of security there is an assumption of choice and sacrifice of one actor for the sake of another one (Bigo, 2008a: 123; Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 2). Since security requires sacrifice, there are losers and winners of security. As opposed to general view of security as public good, for the Paris School, "security cannot global and for all" (Bigo, 2002a: 70). Closely related with this point, as opposed to the traditional understanding that security diminishes insecurity, from the Paris School perspective, security does not mean the opposite of insecurity. Security practices aiming at securing some actors may generate insecurity for others. The attempts for maximum security may result in more insecurity (Balzacq et al., 2010: 2).

To sum up, from the perspective of the Paris School, security has a neither positive nor negative connotation. Security does not have a fixed normative value independent from the actors who pronounce the claim and from the context (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 4).

3.2.3 Security as a Result of a Process of (In)securitization

The Paris School is opposed to the understanding of security as an essential and contested concept whose definition is disagreed among security scholars. As opposed

to treating security as an essential and contested concept, the Paris School understands security as a result of a process of (in)securitization that cannot be reduced to a core meaning such as survival or comfort (Balzacq et al., 2010: 3). Instead of seeking for an essential meaning of security independent from context and actors involved, the Paris School treats security as a "technique of government" (C.A.S.E. Collective, 2006: 457; Huysmans, 2006a: 2). From the perspective of the Paris School, security does not have any meaning by itself. Rather than having an essential meaning by itself, security "is socially and politically central in struggles for political decisions and justification of practices of surveillance, control and punishment as well as practices of protection, reassurance, worrying and surveillance", argues Bigo (2008a: 123-124).

Paris School emphasizes the importance of a constructivist stance in order to understand "how security and insecurity are the product of an (in)securitization process" (Bigo, 2008a: 116). The (in)securitization process is central to the construction of what is security, insecurity, unease, fear, protection, and danger (Balzacq et al., 2010: 2). For the Paris School, an (in)securitization process as a political and social construction involves both speech acts and the security practices of security professionals who are transnational networks of bureaucracies and private agencies (Bigo, 2008a: 116). (In)securitization process involves speech acts that generate a politics of exception. However, from the perspective of the Paris School, speech acts "transforming the decision making process and generating a politics of exception, often favoring coercive options" are not decisive per se (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 5). This is because speech acts are themselves a result of the struggle between

bureaucratic and private agencies over different definitions of security and for various interests (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 4-5). For the Paris School, an (in)securitization process is not limited with discourses of security referring to the narratives of exception or emergency. Instead, the (in)securitization process has to do with daily decisions and routinized practices of everyday politics such as surveillance and management of populations (Balzacq et al., 2010: 3). For the Paris School, the professionals of security and audiences designate the conditions of the possibility of security practices and their acceptance through their routinized practices (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 5). Thus, according to the Paris School, "the process of (in)securitization rests then on the routine abilities of agents to 'manage and control life'" (Bigo, 2008b: 23).

According to the Paris School, the result of an (in)securitization process is not a strategic plan whose objectives are determined beforehand. An (in)securitization process is not necessarily a result of the decision or strategy of an actor or of a dominant actor. This is because as opposed to being exceptions, some (in)securitization processes are routines and mundane practices. The actors involved in the (in)securitization process do not know the final results since the field effect of many actors involved in competition to define what security is shapes the final results of the (in)securitization process. The field effect depends on the capacities of actors to define whose security is prioritized, whose security is sacrificed, what security is and the capacities of audiences to accept these definitions. Thus, rather than analysing the intention of actors involved in (in)securitization process, the Paris

School focuses on the manifestations and effects of security practices (Balzacq et al., 2010: 3; Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 5).

3.2.3.A The Field of (In)Security Professionals

From the perspective of the Paris School, all (in)securitization processes depend on a field of security that is constituted by (in)security professionals competing for defining what security is. From this perspective, to study (in)securitization process requires to focus on practices of professionals of (in)security, their practices' productive power and their creation of meaning. The Paris School connects (in)securitization process to the notion of field. This connection between field and (in)securitization process requires to examine the relations between and practices of professionals of (in)security that involve in field struggles. Such struggles among (in)security professionals shape the boundaries of the field and affect the existence of the field (C.A.S.E. Collective, 2006: 457-458).

The Paris School borrows Bourdieu's (cited in C.A.S.E. Collective, 2006: 458) definition of field as a social space constituted by relations between various but interdependent positions. For the Paris School, there are four main traits that set apart the field of (in)security professionals. First, the field functions as a field of force or a magnetic field or a field of attraction. Understood in such a way, a field homogenizes different and generally competing interests and perspectives of the agents involved. Second, the field is a field of struggles or a battlefield. From this understanding,

means of agents involved in the field may be different. While some actors adopt defensive means, others adopt offensive ones. Thus, a battlefield analogy helps to understand defensive and offensive activities of agents. Third, the field as a field of domination enables (in)security professionals to make truth claims based on know-how and knowledge. Closely related with the third trait, a field is a transversal field of power. Although fields are separate social spaces, their boundaries are permeable. The boundaries of social spaces of (in)security professionals are not fixed. A transversal field reconfigures separate social spaces in a new field by shifting their former borders (Balzacq et al., 2010: 3-4; Bigo, 2008b: 22-23; C.A.S.E. Collective, 2006: 458-459). Agents act at the same time in many different fields. In this way, practices of one field are transferred into other fields. This transversality is called as dispositif by Foucault. Foucault (cited in Balzacq et al., 2010: 3) defines dispositif as:

> a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions – in short, the said as much as the unsaid.

"Transnational guilds of (in)security professionals" is an example of the transversal field (Balzacq et al., 2010: 3-4). There has been a tendency to divide the field into social universes that are internal and external realms in social sciences. Police forces have been assumed to deal with issues belonging to internal realm while military forces have been assumed to deal with issues belonging to external realm. This division of social universe as internal and external realm has led to the ignorance of intermediary agencies such as custom agents and border guards (Bigo, 2000: 320, 324). This division between internal and external realms has disappeared

with the transnationalization of police networks and involvement of military forces in internal issues. The dedifferentiation of internal and external realm has enabled to think of intermediary security professionals. Merging of external and internal security has led to the emergence of a field of professionals of the management of unease (Bigo, 2008b: 15).

To sum up, the Paris School has an interdisciplinary perspective. The School criticizes the security understandings as survival and as a positive value. The Paris School understands security as a result of an (in)securitization process whose result is not a strategy of an actor or a dominant actor but a field effect. This part of the chapter presented an overview of the Paris School's security understanding. The following part will look at the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents in the context of war on terror from the Paris School point of view.

3.3 Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of Liberal States for Referents Other than State

With the aim of showing the need for going beyond the balance argument of the relationship between security and liberty, this part examines the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents in the post 9/11 era from Paris School's perspective. For this purpose, a general perspective of the Paris School on the liberty and security relationship will be presented. Then, how liberal

states understand liberty in the post 9/11 period will be looked at. After that, the "ban-opticon dispositif" will be looked at with the aim of understanding illiberal security practices of liberal states. Lastly, Paris School's understanding of liberty/security relationship in the context of the war on terror will be examined through looking at the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion as security referents.

The Paris School is opposed to the balance argument between liberty and security. Paris School scholars argue that the balance argument has for centuries been used as a justification for limiting liberties. From the perspective of the Paris School, the balance argument creates a hierarchy between the two values, thereby leading to control and surveillance (Bigo et al., 2010b: 12). The Paris School challenges the balance argument of liberty/security in two respects. First, the Paris School goes beyond the balance argument by challenging unified collective security and fragmented individualistic liberty understandings that prioritize security over liberty. Bigo (2010: 270) argues that authors advocating the balance argument understand security in terms of protection, safety and survival. They see security in both collective and unified terms. Unlike a unified and collective security understanding, according to Bigo (2010: 270), they consider liberty in fragmented and individualistic terms. They consider liberty as a series of liberties rather than understanding it as a general principle. As a consequence of these understandings of a unified collective security and fragmented individualistic liberty, security is seen as the first freedom. According to the Paris School, security cannot be complete and

global. Security is neither limitless nor the first freedom, from the perspective of the Paris School (Bigo et al., 2010b: 11).

Second, the Paris School challenges the centrality of danger in the balance understanding that sees security as unified and collective while seeing liberty as fragmented and individualistic. Security and liberty are not only related to each other but also related to danger. There is a three dimensional relationship between liberty, security, and danger. According to the advocates of the balance understanding, a balance between liberty and security needs to be achieved in favor of security because of the probability of danger (Bigo, 2010a: 270). According to the balance understanding, the balance between liberty and security needs to be established in accordance with the assumption that there is a positive relationship between security and danger while there is a negative relationship between security and liberty (Bigo, 2002b: 82). In the relationship between liberty, security, and danger, liberty is seen as the problem by the advocates of the balance argument (Bigo, 2010a: 270). The Paris School challenges the balance argument through questioning the conception of liberty in this triangular relationship between liberty, security and danger. According to the Paris School, taking danger into consideration makes the relationship between liberty and security more complex. Security is thought to have positive connotation for danger and danger is thought to have negative connotation for liberty by the advocates of the balance argument (Bigo, 2002a: 72). As opposed to the assumption that security has a positive connotation for danger, the Paris School argues that security may have negative connotation for danger. From the perspective of the Paris School, danger meaning insecurity is a part of every society. It is not possible to

think a society without danger. Security does not always reduce danger. On the contrary, security may create more danger. Based on this understanding, it is not always a good thing to try to maximize security, from the Paris School's point of view (Bigo, 2006a: 40).

In the context of the post 9/11 period, liberal states have assumed that there is a negative relationship between liberty and danger while there is a positive relationship between security and danger (Bigo & Guittet, 2011: 492). Liberty is not considered as a general principle or as ideal but it is considered as a set of freedoms by liberal states. This means that liberty is redefined as the practices of freedom (Jabri, 2010: 242; Bigo, 2010a: 272). Freedoms are portrayed with their limits and their contradiction with other freedoms. Freedoms are also thought to be in conflict with the freedoms of others by the governments of liberal states (Bigo, 2006a: 35-37, 41)**.** Freedom is seen as a right that needs to be protected from threat and danger. In this understanding of freedom, the real freedom is thought to be the freedom from threat. In other words, in liberal states, there is an understanding of negative freedom **(**Bigo, 2010a: 274; Tsoukala, 2008: 77). It follows from this understanding that surveillance needs to be enhanced in order to protect freedom. They have insisted that the protection of freedom necessitates control. As a result, freedom has been redefined as a form of surveillance and control against threat and danger by liberal states in the post 9/11 period (Bigo, 2006a: 35-37, 41).

Based on this negative liberty understanding, after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, liberal states have insisted that a new balance between liberty and security needs to

be established in favor of security since terrorism threat poses an unprecedented and great risk and danger to the state, nation and people. In the discourses of liberal states, activities of terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda have been referred as a new form of violence that that requires exceptional responses (Bigo et al., 2009: 284). Based on the assumption that an exceptional event legitimizes the priority of security over liberty, in the post 9/11 period the governments of liberal states have employed illiberal security practices because of the possibility of danger (C.A.S.E. Collective, 2006: 465).

From the perspective of the Paris School, illiberal security practices of liberal states in the post 9/11 period have implications on non-state referents of security. The Paris School uses the "ban-opticon dispositif" while examining the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents. This is because according to the Paris School, illiberal security practices are not only a result of the attempts to strike a new balance between liberty and security in favor of security but also a result of "the very functioning of a solidly constituted security field of professionals of the management of unease, both public and private, working together transnationally along professional lines mainly in European and Transatlantic 'working groups'" (Bigo & Tsoukala, 2008: 4).

3.3.1 The Ban-opticon Dispositif

After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, discourses of globalized insecurity in liberal states such as the United States and the United Kingdom have increased. The US and its allies since the 9/11 terrorist attacks have argued that terrorist threat is global and unprecedented so it necessitates global response. The governments of liberal states have insisted that there is a need for globalization of security because of the scope of terrorism threat. From the Paris School point of view, this need for globalization of security has contributed to the dedifferentiation of external and internal security into the field of the professionals of unease management (Bigo, 2006c: 47; Bigo, 2008b: 15). According to Bigo (2008b: 10), merging of internal and external security into a field of professionals of the management of unease explains how the "ban-opticon dispositif", that is the governmentality of unease, has been established in relation to unease.

Unlike Foucault's notion of pan-opticon, which means the management of society, "ban-opticon" (the governmentality of unease) does not refer to the surveillance or control of everybody (Bigo, 2008b: 32). It refers to the surveillance and control of a small percentage of people who are constructed as "abnormal" (Bigo, 2008b: 36). A small number of people is under surveillance on the grounds of their undesired future behavior while majority who is normalized is free from surveillance and control (Bigo, 2008b: 32; Bigo & Guild, 2007: 3). From the Paris School perspective, the surveillance of a number of people does not signify an exception but it turns into an everyday routine that has been accepted by the public.

The “ban-opticon” seeks to account for how this routine and acceptance of this routine by the public protects some at the expense of others (Bigo, 2006c: 47). According to the Paris School, there are three characteristics of the “ban-opticon dispositif” that help understand the conduct of surveillance and control of this small percentage of people. These three characteristics of the “ban-opticon” are exceptionalism, exclusion of certain groups and normalization of non-excluded (Bigo, 2008b: 32).

One of the meanings of exceptionalism refers to the enactment of special laws and legitimizing effects of these special laws such as extraordinary measures and state of emergency or exception. Enactment of special laws suspends normalized law making and generates the idea of “permanent state of exception” (Bigo, 2008b: 33). Another meaning of exceptionalism, according to the Paris School, refers to “the routinized dispositif of technologies of control and surveillance” (Bigo, 2008b: 33). From the perspective of the Paris School, exceptionalism is related with governmentality of unease that makes exceptional security practices ordinary (Bigo, 2006c: 47). It follows from this argument that exceptionalism is a result of routinized daily practices of security professionals (Bigo et al., 2010b: 5). Exception is not a moment of decision but it is a kind of governmentality (Bigo, 2008b: 33).

After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, which have been seen as unprecedented events and interpreted as exceptional, some of the liberal states such as Australia, the UK, and the US have declared state of emergency. Based on the idea that terrorist threat is new and unpredictable, some of the liberal states have insisted that exceptional

measures such as deviation from the rule of law is necessary in order to protect people and state and reassure collective survival from terrorism threat (Tsoukala, 2008: 49-60). However, according to the Paris School, declaration of state of emergency or adoption of exceptional measures is not at the heart of "ban-opticon". "Ban-opticon" is not only related to declaration of state of emergency but also related to routines of surveillance "that reframes the boundary between the norm and the exception", from the perspective of the Paris School (Bigo, 2006c: 48, 53).

Most of the liberal states did not declare state of emergency but they have employed technologies of surveillance, such as activity recognition, facial recognition and gait-based recognition, in order to deal with terrorism threat. Although it is accepted that technology cannot assure security, in liberal states there is such an assumption that security cannot be achieved without the help of technology. It follows from this assumption that there is a close connection between surveillance and security (Wright et al., 2010: 344, 347-348). Based on this understanding, in the post 9/11 period, technologies of surveillance and control have dominated the security practices of liberal states (Bigo, 2011: 34; Bigo et al., 2010a: 49). Surveillance has been seen as a measure that prevents worst-case scenarios. In order to prevent future terrorist attacks, people have started to be monitored and searched before any attack occurs (Bigo et al., 2010b: 3).

The logic behind surveillance is preemption and not deterrence. The aim of surveillance is to predict the future behaviors of the observed before an attack is realized as opposed to post-crime investigation (Kessler & Werner, 2008: 300; Bigo,

2011: 34). Because of the shift to preemptive risk management from post-crime investigation in the post 9/11 period, surveillance has become the main method of control for governments of liberal states in the fight against terrorism (Bigo et al., 2010a: 55; Salter, 2010: 189-191, 193).

As a result of the established linkage between surveillance and security, surveillance has become omnipresent in liberal states and has turned into an everyday practice in the post 9/11 period. Since surveillance of a number of people has been routinized and normalized, its legitimacy, efficiency, and proportionality have been no longer questioned (Wright et al., 2010: 343-344). Exceptionalism, which is the routinized security practices of liberal states, including derogatory measures and surveillance and control technologies, is one of the characteristics of the "ban-opticon dispositif".

The second feature of "ban-opticon" is the exclusion of foreigners who are constructed as "abnormal" (Bigo, 2008b: 36). In other words, the profiling of foreigners constitutes second characteristic of the "ban-opticon dispositif". Risk is sought to be managed through creating categories of excluded people. Who would be categorized as foreigner or "abnormal" has been decided based on technologies of profiling. The status of foreigner is no longer exclusive to non-citizens but it includes people whose behaviors have been interpreted as different from the behaviors of normalized people by security professionals. Those people whose behaviors and actions have been seen as deviant from normalized ones and as suspicious are targeted by the professionals of security (Bigo, 2006c: 59-60; Bigo et al., 2010b: 13).

With the aim of risk management, excluded people who are constructed as "abnormal" are sought to be deterred while majority of people is sought to be reassured by the liberal states in the post 9/11 period. Risk management is conducted by police forces, military forces, and intermediary security officials based on proactive techniques. Proactive techniques refer to the techniques of predicting the behaviors of people. In line with the object of risk management, information on excluded people is sought to be acquired (Bigo, 2008b: 35). The logic behind the collection of information on excluded people is prevention. An individual or a group that is potentially dangerous is surveyed with the aim of preventing an attack beforehand (Bigo, 2008b: 36).

Normalization, which is the third characteristic of "ban-opticon", refers to the free movement of people. While some people are free to move globally, others could not benefit from the right of movement. According to the Paris School, discourses and practices of liberal states on the right of free movement normalize a great number of people while "abnormalizing" a small number of people (Bigo, 2008b: 36). For those normalized people, surveillance is not a problem. This is because they are not stopped during their travel. However, the "abnormalization" of some individuals enables and legitimizes surveillance of minority (Bigo, 2011: 41). It has been done by liberal states a differentiation between normalized people who are not negatively affected by surveillance and people who are alienated from society (Bigo, 2006c: 63).

In conclusion, exceptionalism, exclusion and normalization are the three characteristics of the "ban-opticon dispositif" that depends on the function of the field of the professionals of unease management. This "ban-opticon dispositif" refers to the surveillance and control of a constructed minority. Through the "ban-opticon dispositif" that explains the sacrifice of some in the name of protection of majority, the Paris School focuses on the implications of practices of security professionals in the post 9/11 period for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion.

3.3.2 Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of Liberal States for Civil Liberties, Immigrants, Asylum-Seekers, and Social Cohesion

Terrorism has been increasingly seen as a threat to the national security, state security, public safety, values of society such as democracy and liberty by liberal states in the post 9/11 period. Based on this understanding, liberal states have prioritized security over liberty. According to the Paris School, governments of liberal states have sought to reassure public opinion by adopting counter-terrorism measures that include illiberal security practices. These illiberal security practices that necessitate derogations from liberty in the name of security have turned into routinized practices of liberal states in the post 9/11 period, argues the Paris School (Bonelli, 2008: 103; Tsoukala, 2008: 91). From the perspective of the Paris School, these routinized illiberal security practices have had implications for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion.

First, curtailment of civil liberties constitutes the main concern in the context of the war on terror, for the Paris School. Governments of liberal states have argued that it is not possible to put at risk national security and public safety. Based on this understanding, liberal states have adopted counter-terrorism measures that necessitate restrictions in civil liberties of individuals. Illiberal security practices that violate civil liberties have legitimized on the grounds of security of public and nation (Tsoukala, 2008: 73-74; Tsoukala, 2007: 167). In the context of the war on terror, the need to reassure public has led to the infringement of individual rights and liberties such as the right of movement and privacy, from the perspective of the Paris School (Bigo et al., 2007: 12-13). Individuals' civil liberties have been violated in the name of security. Surveillance, control and increase in police powers have become routine practices in the post 9/11 period, argues the Paris School.

The Paris School argues that governments cannot justify the restriction of civil liberties based on the fear of insecurity of some individuals because "[t]he government does not have the right to play with the fear of population" (Bigo, 2006a: 43). In line with this argument, from a Paris School point of view, the practices of curtailment of civil liberties in the name of providing for assurance to some people cannot be justified. Any restriction of civil liberties cannot defeat violence. The restriction of civil liberties in the name of the protection of human beings from violence does not provide for more security since these restrictions in the liberties and rights of individuals create also unease and risk (Bigo & Guittet, 2011: 494). According to Bigo (2006a: 42), since both material threats and immaterial threats coexist and enhance each other in "provocation-repression" cycle, terrorism and

counter-terrorism measures which include the curtailment of civil liberties are two sources of unease and risk.

For the Paris School, illiberal security practices adopted by liberal states in the post 9/11 period have also had implications for immigrants and asylum-seekers. The fact that the perpetrators of the 9/11 terrorist attacks were nationals of countries outside the liberal states enabled the construction of a link between terrorism and foreigners. This situation contributed to the establishment of a close link between terrorism, immigration and asylum. Immigration and asylum have been connected to the problem of terrorism (Guild, 2003: 334; Tsoukala, 2007: 163). In liberal states, it is thought that the threat of terrorism has been coming from a number of people among immigrants and asylum-seekers. In the discourses of the governments of liberal states, it is stated that there is a high possibility that terrorists may recruit among immigrants and asylum-seekers. Therefore, immigration and asylum have been seen as security issues, according to the Paris School.

One of the consequences of this presumed association between terrorism, immigration and asylum is that liberal states have toughened their policy of immigration and asylum (Bigo et al., 2010a: 59; Tsoukala, 2008: 66). Border controls, visa requirements have been hardened as a counter-terrorism measure in the post 9/11 period. These strict border and visa controls have victimized people who have to cross the border for their security. People who are least likely to obtain visas and need to cross border to seek of their security have become the victims of

hardened immigration and asylum policies of liberal sates in the post 9/11 period, from the Paris School point of view (Guild, 2003: 332).

Illiberal security practices adopted by liberal states in the post 9/11 period have also had implications for social cohesion, according to the Paris School. Immigrants, asylum-seekers, and domestic Muslims have been subjected to the social exclusion in liberal states in the post 9/11 period, argues the Paris School. From a Paris School point of view, the presumed connection between immigration, asylum and terrorism increases the suspicion against immigrants, who is "a foreigner or a national citizen representing a minority" depending on the context, and asylum-seekers (Bigo, 2001: 112). This is because in the post 9/11 period, immigrants and asylum-seekers are thought to be "fifth column" that plays in accordance with the interests of global terrorist networks (Tsoukala, 2008: 66).

Such suspicion against immigrants and asylum-seekers has led to the disintegration of social cohesion. Immigrants and asylum-seekers have been constructed as the other and excluded from society. This is because they have been seen as an internal threat to the survival of the state (Huysmans, 2000: 758). Practices of security professionals and anti-terrorism legislation have resulted in the exclusion of the people who have previously been accepted as included, from the perspective of the Paris School. Human beings that have previously been seen as a part of society are now seen as "enemies" within the society (Bigo et al., 2008: 291). "Enemy" has been constructed as irrational and bad. As a result of this construction

of “enemy” as irrational and bad, the other has been excluded from society, according to the Paris School (Tsoukala, 2008: 61-62).

Domestic Muslims have been also subjected to social exclusion. For the Paris School, people who the illiberal security practices have hit most have been targeted on the grounds of their religious beliefs (Guild, 2003: 336). This is because there has been suspicion towards Muslim people in liberal states, according to the Paris School. In the discourses of policy makers of liberal states, domestic Muslims have been constructed as the foreigner who poses threat to the security of state, nation and people (Bigo et al., 2008: 299). This is because the perpetrators of the 9/11 terrorist attacks were people who worship according to Islam.

As a result, liberal states have seen Muslim people as the “fifth column” in the society that put Islamic identity first against national identity, according to the Paris School. Based on this suspicion against Muslims, “Muslim community” has been put under surveillance by security agencies in liberal states. For example, sermons in mosques have been increasingly monitored after the 9/11 terrorist attacks (Bonelli, 2008: 107, 112-114). According to the Paris School, targeting of Muslim groups has led to an increase in feelings of social discrimination and radicalization of some people who have already felt excluded (Bigo, 2002b: 84). Rhetoric of polarization facilitates the recruitment of people from small groups to clandestine organizations due to the enhancement of feeling of exclusion (Bigo et al., 2007: 5).

To sum up, according to the Paris School, illiberal security practices of liberal states have implications on civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion as security referents. In the post 9/11 period, the curtailment of civil liberties in the name of security constitutes the main concern for the Paris School. Restrictions in immigration and asylum policies of liberal states are another concern for the Paris School in the context of war on terror. The Paris School also focuses on the disintegration of social cohesion because of illiberal practices of liberal states that target specific groups based on religious categories.

This part of the chapter began by looking at Paris School's broad perspective on liberty/security relationship. Then, it looked at the "ban-opticon dispositif" with the aim of understanding illiberal security practices of liberal states. Finally, this part of the chapter focused on the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion. The following part will look at what security practices should be adopted in the post 9/11 period from the Paris School point of view.

3.4 How to Overcome the Implications of Illiberal Security Practices of Liberal States for Non-State Referents? The Paris School Perspective

From the perspective of the Paris School, counter-terrorism measures adopted by liberal states have not served their objective but have resulted in more unease, danger

and risk. One of the implications of illiberal security practices implemented by liberal states in the post 9/11 period is for civil liberties, according to the Paris School. Rather than implementing counter-terrorism measures that necessitate restrictions in civil liberties, from the perspective of the Paris School, cooperation among security agencies needs to be promoted in respect of civil liberties and human rights. According to the Paris School, judicial protection of civil liberties and rights of individuals needs to be at the heart of the war on terror (Bigo, 2002a: 75, 81).

Moreover, in the post 9/11 period, a link between immigrants, asylum-seekers and terrorism has been constructed. As a result of this presumed association, border controls and visa requirements have been hardened as security measures. Liberal states have restricted their immigration and asylum policies. However, according to the Paris School, terrorists could not be prevented through hardened border controls. For the Paris School, those restrictions on immigration and asylum would undermine civil liberties and rights of individuals (Bigo, 2002b: 77-79).

Lastly, counter-terrorism measures have led to the disintegration of social cohesion through targeting specific groups based on religious beliefs, according to the Paris School. Surveillance systems, for instance, lead to the discrimination among individuals since they targeted particular groups such as immigrants and Muslims. Since counter-terrorism measures are unequal and are not applied to "the same people in the same way", they constitute unease (Bigo, 2006c: 57). Counter-terrorism measures would pose a threat to social stability by deepening already existing cleavages in the societies. The Paris School is opposed to the labeling of

some groups as the source of the threat. From the perspective of the Paris School, liberal states need to adopt counter-terrorism measures such as surveillance that do not undermine social cohesion through targeting certain groups based on ethnic and religious categories. According to the Paris School, practices and discourses of polarization need to be avoided and the importance of civic solidarity needs to be emphasized since all individuals are equally subjected to the terrorist threat (Bigo, 2002b: 75-76, 82, 91).

Consequently, according to the Paris School (Bigo et al., 2007: 15), counter-terrorism measures adopted by liberal states such as border controls, and repression of "the other" could not provide for protection. On the contrary, these illiberal security practices of liberal states have led to more unease, risk, and danger, argues the Paris School. This is because from the perspective of the Paris School, security is a tool for the assurance and continuation of liberties (Bigo et al., 2007: 15). Therefore, for the Paris School, the problem of terrorism "should not be defined in terms of balance" between liberty and security (Bigo et al., 2009: 293). According to the Paris School, liberty and security are complementary and not conflicting values. Security is rooted from liberty, from the Paris School perspective. In the context of the war on terror, all security practices and policies should be based on this understanding says the Paris School (Bigo et al., 2007: 15).

In line with this view, Bigo criticizes governments' rhetoric of the need for prioritizing security, and governments' security measures that involves restrictions in civil liberties (Bigo, 2006c). He argues that protection can only be achieved through

enabling different ways of life coexist. According to the Paris School, governments of liberal states need to mediate different groups who have different value systems to overcome the threat of terrorism. Liberal states need to communicate with clandestine organization in order to become successful in the fight against terrorism, from the Paris School point of view (Bigo, 2002b: 78-79; Bigo & Guittet, 2011: 494).

To sum up, this part of the chapter looked at the question of how to overcome the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than state from the Paris School perspective through focusing on Paris School's understanding that security is rooted from liberty.

3.5 Conclusion

The main objective of Chapter 3 was to answer the question of what the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states are for referents other than states in the context of the war on terror from the perspective of the Paris School. In doing so, this chapter sought to show the need for going beyond the balance argument of the security/liberty relationship. In line with this aim, an assessment of Paris School's security understanding was presented. According to the Paris School, security is not a positive value but a result of insecuritization process. It does not have any meaning *per se*. It follows from this understanding that, security is not the primary value, for the Paris School. In addition, the Paris School argues that security does not always

have positive connotation for danger. As a result of this security understanding, it goes beyond the traditional balance argument between liberty and security. This Chapter presented that by going beyond the balance argument, the Paris School focuses on civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion as the referent objects of security. This chapter tried to show that through going beyond the balance argument between liberty and security, the Paris School questions the illiberal security practices of liberal states in the post 9/11 period. Chapter 4 now will look at the case of United Kingdom as a liberal state in the context of war on terror from the perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School in a comparative manner.

CHAPTER 4

THE UNITED KINGDOM CASE IN THE POST 9/11 ERA: ABERYSTWYTH AND PARIS SCHOOLS COMPARED

4.1 Introduction

The United Kingdom (UK), which is one of the oldest democracies in the world, has a long liberal tradition. Furthermore, the UK has been struggling against the problem of terrorism even before the 9/11 terrorist attacks. In spite of its long liberal tradition and almost 60 years experience of struggle against terrorism, after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, politicians and security professionals in the UK called for a new balance between liberty and security. In line with this emphasis on the need of striking of a new balance between the two values, the UK has adopted new counter-terrorism measures in the post 9/11 period. Accordingly, the UK is a good example of the persistence of the need for re/considering the relationship between liberty and security.

The main objective of Chapter 4 is to show whether the Aberystwyth School or the Paris School is more fruitful in terms of reflecting the insecurities faced by

non-state referents in the post 9/11 era. In line with this aim, this chapter examines the implications of illiberal security practices for non-state referents in the UK case as a liberal state from the perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School. Chapter 4 is composed of three parts. The first part looks at reframing of terrorism threat, reframing of the relationship between liberty and security, and counter-terrorism legislation in the UK after the 9/11 terrorist attacks to give general information about UK's illiberal security practices in the post 9/11 period. The second part of the chapter examines the implications of the illiberal security practices of the UK in the context of the war on terror for non-state referents of security from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School. The last part examines the implications of the illiberal security practices of the UK in the context of the war on terror for security referents other than states from the perspective of the Paris School.

4.2 Post 9/11 Counter-Terrorism Legislation in the United Kingdom

With the aim of giving a general information about the illiberal security practices of the UK in the post 9/11 period, this part of the chapter looks at the reframing of terrorism threat, reframing of the relationship between liberty and security, and new counter-terrorism legislation in the UK after the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

Even before the 9/11 terrorist attacks, in the UK there had been counter-terrorism laws that were enacted as a response to the attacks of the Irish Republican Army (IRA) (Golder & Williams, 2006: 45). The Terrorism Act 2000 consolidated

previous counter-terrorism laws that had been enacted as a response to IRA's terrorist activities. This law was the UK's first permanent counter-terrorism law (Horne, 2010). However, as a result of the reframing of terrorism threat and of the relationship between liberty and security after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Blair Ministry (1997-2007) was in favor of further counter-terrorism legislation in order to prevent possible terrorist attacks. Immediately after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair (2001a) stated that "we have agreed to keep in place the additional security measures" due to the reframing of terrorism threat.

In the post 9/11 era, the UK governments that are the Blair Ministry (1997-2007), Brown Ministry (2007-2010), and Cameron Ministry (Coalition Government, 2010-onwards) have seen terrorism as a security threat directed towards the liberal states (Jabri, 2010: 244). Although these three subsequent governments' views diverge on a great number of issues, their views on the threat of terrorism and on counter-terrorism measures are almost overlapping. The threat of terrorism was framed as an extraordinary, limitless and long-lasting by the UK governments. The UK governments and some policy makers in the UK have interpreted the threat of terrorism as extraordinary because of its newness and scale (Tsoukala, 2008: 54-55). In the UK, the 9/11 terrorist attacks was interpreted as radically new since it was believed to signify a turning point in history. A great majority of politicians in the UK argued that the newness of the terrorism threat was unquestionable. For example, former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair (2001b) stated that "it was the events of September 11 that marked a turning point in history". In the discourses of politicians and security professionals, it was asserted that the scale of terrorist attacks makes

terrorism threat exceptional in the post 9/11 era. Tony Blair emphasized the unprecedented scale of terrorism by stating that "the modern terrorist knows no bounds of geography, inhumanity or scale" (Blair cited in Wintour, 2002). Similarly, Peter Kilfoyle (2004), a British Labor Party politician, argued that the scale of the 9/11 terrorist attacks was different. The Prime Ministers of subsequent UK governments have also seen terrorism as an exceptional threat and the greatest threat to the security of the UK (Brown, 2009; Cameron, 2010).

Terrorism threat to the UK was also interpreted as limitless in terms of its methods and targets. The politicians and security professionals of the UK argued that methods of terrorists are changing, developing and shifting. According to British Security Service MI5 (2012b), terrorists are using more sophisticated methods. Also, security agencies and most of the UK politicians have represented terrorism threat as limitless in regard to its targets in the UK. Security professionals in the UK have argued that institutions of the state, places of entertainment and public spaces could be targets of terrorists. For example, Chief Superintendent Bill Tillbrook and Superintendent Chris Bradford, who are members of the UK police department, expressed that terrorists might target one of these places (cited in Cowan, 2005). The UK Security Service MI5 also emphasized the limitless nature of terrorism threat by stating that "terrorists continue to aspire to attack high-profile targets in the UK" and "major public events such as the 2012 Olympics present new opportunities for terrorists" (MI5, 2012b).

According to the rhetoric of politicians and security professionals in the UK, the threat of terrorism is expected to be long-lasting. The 9/11 terrorist attacks is interpreted as the beginning of a future of terrorist attacks (MI5, 2012b). According to Blair (2003), terrorism is "the security threat of the twenty-first century". It is argued that terrorist attacks are inevitable since the UK is an ally of the United States. According to the discourses of politicians and security professionals, terrorist threat would not end for a long time even if al-Qaeda were to be overcome. This is because terrorist organizations have organized globally. Also, British policy makers have argued that terrorists are ideologically driven in the post 9/11 period (Blair, 2003: Blair, 2005a). This ideological character makes recruitment of new terrorists easy for leaders of terrorist organization. Based on these arguments, British policy makers have asserted that the UK needs to develop extensive counter-terrorism measures to respond terrorism threat (Blair, 2011).

By reframing of terrorism threat as extraordinary, limitless and long-lasting after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the three subsequent UK governments have followed a strategy that requires striking a new balance between liberty and security in favor of security. This is because the UK governments have seen the liberty and security as two separate values that are in conflict. The war on terrorism is represented "in terms of a 'balance' between liberty and security" (Jabri, 2010: 244-245). This balancing understanding is evident in the discourses of the UK officials. In line with this understanding, security is prioritized over liberty on the grounds that terrorism poses an unprecedented security threat to the survival of the nation and to public security. In the statements of politicians and security agents, it is emphasized that security

comes first, after then liberty comes. For instance, in one of his speeches, Tony Blair stressed the priority of security over liberty by stating that "the rules of the game are changing" because "the circumstances of our national security have now self-evidently changed" due to the exceptional threat of terrorism (Blair, 2005b). Similarly, Gordon Brown, the Prime Minister of the UK in the years between 2007 and 2010, represented the war on terror in terms of a balance between liberty and security. Although he stressed the importance of the protection of liberty, he emphasized the priority of security for the continuation of liberty (Brown, 2009). In a similar way, even 9 years later of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, security is prioritized over liberty by the Coalition Government. In the Coalition's Programme for Government, although the importance of freedom has been emphasized, it is stated that "the first duty of government is to safeguard our national security" (Cameron & Clegg, 2010: 7, 11, 24). Similarly, in the Cameron Ministry, the Secretary of State for the Home Department Theresa May (2011: 3) argued that protecting national security is the primary responsibility of the UK government. She (2011: 3) emphasized that the government cannot put national security at risk. Therefore, the general argument in the three subsequent governments and among the high-ranked UK policymakers is that other values including liberty are meaningless without security.

In line with this prioritization of security, as a response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the three UK governments have implemented counter-terrorism measures that are in conflict with the value of liberty. For example, in the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Tony Blair (2001b) emphasized the importance of

additional security measures by stating “11 September is bringing governments and people to reflect, consider and change”. In line with this understanding, immediately after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the UK governments supplemented and extended its counter-terrorism legislation in the name of security from terrorism threat. As a result, several counter-terrorism laws have been enacted in the UK in the context of the war on terror.

The first counter-terrorism law enacted after the 9/11 terrorist attacks is the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 (ATCSA). This counter-terrorism law was enacted easily and without scrutiny (Golder & Williams, 2006: 46-47). It was reactive to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The most striking aspect of this counter-terrorism law is that the UK sacrificed from the European Convention on Human Rights in regard to detention. This law authorizes the home secretary to detain a foreigner that is a terrorism suspect for indeterminate period (ATCSA, 2001). The UK’s second post 9/11 counter-terrorism law, that is the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005, passed in the Parliament. This counter-terrorism law was followed by the Terrorism Act 2006 as a reaction to the London Bombings of 2005. This law defined the glorification of terrorism as an offence. In 2008, another counter-terrorism law, the Counter-Terrorism Act, was enacted in the UK. On 14 December 2011 the Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures Act were adopted. Part 1 of this law repealed the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005. Through the enactment of these counter-terrorism laws, powers of security professionals increased and new criminal sanctions such as prolonged detention periods were adopted.

To sum up, this part of the chapter looked at the reframing of terrorism threat and of the relationship between liberty and security. Then, this part briefly overviewed the counter-terrorism legislation of the UK in the post 9/11 period. The following part will examine the implications of illiberal security practices of the UK in the context of the war on terror for referents other than state from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School.

4.3 The Case of the UK from the Perspective of the Aberystwyth School

This part of Chapter 4 aims to show the need for going beyond the balance argument of the relationship between liberty and security through examining the implications of the illiberal security practices of the UK in the post 9/11 period for referents other than the state from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School. In line with this aim, this part considers on which grounds the UK has justified illiberal security practices in the post 9/11 era from the Aberystwyth School point of view. Then, this part examines the implications of counter-terrorism measures of the UK for individuals that are Muslim citizens and non-citizens of the UK in the case of the war on terror from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School.

From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, because of dualistic thinking that has been dominant in the UK, illiberal security practices have been seen as a solution to the threat of terrorism (Booth, 2006: 45). For the Aberystwyth

School, as a result of the dominance of dualistic thinking, the UK has asserted that exceptional methods that include illiberal security practices are required in order to fight against terrorism in the post 9/11 period. Dualistic thinking has justified the use of forms of violence including torture against "the other" who poses the threat of terrorism (Linklater, 2007: 111-112). For example, as a measure to the threat of terrorism, in the UK, it is allowed to use information gathered under torture. It is allowed that as long as British security agencies do not involve in the act of torture, the information extracted under torture that is crucial for national and public security can be used (British Government's Secret Interrogation Policy Document, 2011: 81). From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, allowing the use of information extracted under torture in the UK in the post 9/11 period is a result of dualistic thinking. Also, because of the dualistic thinking, on the grounds of security from terrorism, the rule of law has been violated through adopting some counter-terrorism measures. For instance, counter-terrorism laws in the post 9/11 period have extended detention periods. In the 4th Report of the House of Commons (House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, 2006: 3-4), it was argued that extended detention periods are legitimate and useful for public safety because of the changing nature of terrorism threat. According to the Amnesty International (2010), extended detention periods contradict with the rule of law.

From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, illiberal security practices of liberal states in the context of the war on terror have created more insecurity for individual human beings than the threat of terrorism (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 161-162). Therefore, the Aberystwyth School focuses on individuals who are insecure

because of the existing counter-terrorism practices and policies of the UK as the referent object of security. As a result, in the context of the war on terror, victims of counter-terrorism measures constitute the main referent object of security for the Aberystwyth School (McDonald, 2007: 257). According to the Aberystwyth School point of view, victims of counter-terrorism measures include Muslim citizens who are constructed as the other and individuals who are non-citizens in the case of the UK. This is because among the politicians and security officials of the UK, there has been such a suspicion that the threat of terrorism may come from both "home-grown varieties" and non-citizens (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 163). The UK Security Service MI5 (2012a) has insisted that a number of UK nationals and foreigners living in the UK have connections with international terrorist organizations.

In the post 9/11 period of the UK, there has emerged a suspicion that the threat of terrorism has been coming from home-grown varieties that is a small number of outlawed individuals who belong to "the Muslim community". As a result of this suspicion, a link between Muslims and terrorism has been constructed in the UK in the context of the war on terror. From the Aberystwyth School perspective, this presumed link between Muslims and terrorism has led Muslim people to be seen as the potential "enemy within" (Jackson, 2007: 405-412). In line with this "enemy within" understanding, treating people who worship according to Islam as "enemy" who poses a threat to the national and public security has become a respectable attitude in the UK (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 127).

According to the Aberystwyth School, such a suspicion against domestic Muslims has resulted in a communitarian categorization of Muslim citizens of the UK. In the UK, Muslim citizens' other identity characteristics have been ignored and they have categorized only according to their religious beliefs under "the Muslim community". Religion has been considered as the most decisive element of identity in the post 9/11 period of the UK (Appleby, 2010: 421). In the UK, the communitarian categorization of people who worship according to Islam under "the Muslim community" has been reinforced through the use of evil discourse for the 9/11 terrorist attacks and perpetrators of these attacks (Jackson, 2007: 409). In the discourses of the high officials of the UK, terrorists have been portrayed in dehumanized terms while their actions have been presented as evil. As a result of demonization, terrorism has been seen as religiously motivated, irrational, violent, fanatic, and murderous by the UK officials. For example, in his speeches, Tony Blair (2004; 2005a) emphasized the violent and irrational aspect of terrorists and terrorist activities.

According to the Aberystwyth School, in the UK case, the construction of Muslim people as "enemy within", Muslim people's communitarian categorization, and the adoption of evil discourse have also resulted in the rejection of domestic Muslims' certain rights and liberties (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 127, 211). For example, the Labor government adopted policies that aim to prevent recruitment of university students into extremist organizations. As a result of this counter-terrorism measure of the government, the activities of Muslim students and Islamic organizations have been monitored and restricted (Appleby, 2010: 421-422).

According to a document obtained by the British newspaper *the Guardian*, it is encouraged by the Department of Education that academicians would report Muslim students who are seen as suspicious of involvement in radical groups or of supporting terrorism (Dodd, 2006). Another document prepared by the Department for Education and Skills is *Promoting Good Campus Relations: Working with Staff and Students to Build Community Cohesion and Tackle Violent Extremism in The Name of Islam at Universities and Colleges* (2006). This document draws the boundaries of behavior and defines extremist behaviors and views. As a result, this document restricts freedom of speech of Muslim people.

Another example to the violation of civil rights and liberties of Muslim citizens is the extended detention periods. For instance, a Muslim university student was held under custody for seven days without charge based on suspicion of being a terrorist. He was taken under custody because he was suspected of having downloaded an al-Qaida training manual for terrorist purposes. He was released from police custody when it is understood that he was researching on terrorist tactics for his postgraduate studies (Townsend, 2012). Although al-Qaida training manual has been freely available in many official and unofficial websites of the UK, a Muslim student had been detained for researching this document for his MA dissertation. This case illustrates how Muslim people have been treated as potential enemies in the UK.

Another consequence of the establishment of a link between terrorism and Islam, categorization of Muslims under “the Muslim community”, and demonization

of terrorists is the increase of xenophobia and racism against Muslims in the UK, according to the Aberystwyth School (Linklater, 2002: 306). Muslim people have been seen as the other and subjected to discrimination in the UK. Muslim citizens have been alienated from the rest of the society in the UK (Appleby, 2010: 421-422). For instance, in the UK, citizens' reporting of suspicious behaviors that include activities such as going radical mosques has been encouraged by the government (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 127).

From an Aberystwyth School point of view, as a result of an increase in xenophobia and racism against Muslims, in the UK there have been a number of faith-hate crimes against Muslims (House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, 2006). According to the Report of Human Rights First Organization (2007: 4), there have been a lot of attacks on mosques and Muslim religious centers in the UK in the context of the war on terror. The 2007 Report of Human Rights First Organization shows that as a result of increasing Islamophobia, some mosques were attempted to be set on fire while some of them were thrown stones at. For example, a city mosque, the Jamiat Tablighul Islam Mosque, in the UK was attacked. It was attempted to be set on fire according to police forces (BBC News, 2005). The statistics held by Cosmopolitan Police Service (2008) show the increase in faith hate crimes against Muslim people in the UK. For example, between the years of 2005 and 2008, 2447 faith hate crimes have been happened in the UK, according to the survey conducted by Cosmopolitan Police Survey (2008: 12).

Also, as a result of communitarian categorization of Muslim people and of the use of evil discourse, multiculturalism which used to be a positive term has since then been turned into a negative term in the UK. Current Prime Minister David Cameron (2011) has criticized the policy of multiculturalism. He has argued that multiculturalism fosters extremism and increases the number of home-grown terrorists. He has emphasized that multiculturalism is the main factor contributing the radicalization of domestic Muslims. In line with this anti-multiculturalism stance, Cameron (2011) has argued that Islamic organizations that do not respect and promote the values of the UK would not be funded by the government. According to the Aberystwyth School, such discourses of high level officials and practices of the government against multiculturalism would contribute to Islamphobia in the UK (Booth & Dunne, 2011: 163).

From the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, the illiberal security practices of the UK in the post 9/11 period have also implications for non-citizens that are immigrants and the "rightless" people in the UK. According to the Aberystwyth School, although political community is at the center of security, in the context of the war on terror, it turns into an institution of oppression for non-citizens (Booth, 2007: 268). This is because in the name of security from the threat of terrorism, civil liberties and rights of immigrants and rightless people have been violated in the UK (Booth & Dunne, 2002: 20). In the post 9/11 period of the UK, derogations from some civil liberties and rights of non-citizens have been legitimized on the grounds of a distinction made between the rights of citizens and human rights.

In line with this distinction, the three subsequent UK governments have legislated counter-terrorism laws that deny some basic rights and liberties of non-citizens.

The UK Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 (ATCSA) is one of the counter-terrorism laws that violate rights and liberties of non-citizens. The most striking aspect of this law is that it legitimizes the indefinite detention of foreigners who are suspects of terrorism without charge or conviction. For instance, an asylum-seeker had been held under custody for 76 hours without being informed of the reasons of his detention (Amnesty International, 2007). Forced deportation of suspects of terrorism constitutes another example of violation of civil rights and liberties of non-citizens in the UK case (Amnesty International, 2008). The UK violated the right of asylum seekers and refugees not to be returned to the country which poses a threat to their lives and needs in the context of the war on terror. The UK received diplomatic assurances from countries whose human rights conditions have been questionable while deporting a suspect of terrorism from the UK. Based on diplomatic assurances, the UK involved in some forced returns of non-citizens. However, according to some Human Rights Organizations such as LIBERTY and Amnesty International (2010), diplomatic assurances are unreliable tools for preventing torture, inhuman treatment and violations of fundamental freedoms. According to the 2011 Report of Amnesty International, the UK involved in some forced deportations that resulted in deaths of people.

Also, the UK security officials involved in some cases of extraordinary rendition that meant the violation of the basic civil rights and liberties of non-

citizens. The UK has helped the US in rendition of those people who have been sent to countries where they would be subjected to torture, interrogation and detention. For example, David Miliband (2008), the British Foreign Secretary of the Labour government, admitted that Diego Garcia had been used for extraordinary rendition flights two times in 2002. As a result, for the Aberystwyth School, in the context of the war on terror, the illiberal security practices of the UK have constituted a security threat for non-citizens who do not enjoy the rights and liberties that full members enjoy (Linklater, 2005: 116).

To sum up, according to the Aberystwyth School, the three subsequent UK governments, some policy makers, and security agencies have seen the relationship between liberty and security in balancing terms and interprets the threat of terrorism as exceptional. As a result, in the UK, illiberal security practices have been legitimized on the grounds of security from terrorism threat. However, for the Aberystwyth School, these illiberal security practices implemented by the UK as a response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks have not resulted in more security. This is because, according to the Aberystwyth School, these illiberal security practices of the UK have implications for Muslim citizens and non-citizens of the UK as security referents other than state. Muslim citizens have been subjected to discriminatory practices in the name of security from terrorism. Also, their civil rights and liberties have been violated in the context of the war on terror. Similarly, non-citizens' rights and liberties have been sacrificed on the grounds of security from terrorism.

With the aim of showing the need for going beyond the balance argument of the liberty/security relationship, this part of Chapter 4 examined the implications of the illiberal security practices of the UK for Muslim citizens and non-citizens from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School. The following part will look at the implications of the illiberal security practices of the UK for referents of security other than state in the context of the war on terror.

4.4 The Case of the UK from the Perspective of the Paris School

This part of Chapter 4 aims to show the need to going beyond the balance argument of the relationship between liberty and security through examining the implications of the illiberal security practices of the United Kingdom (UK) in the post 9/11 period for referents other than states, from the perspective of the Paris School. In line with this aim, this part briefly looks at how security is prioritized over liberty in the post 9/11 period of the UK. Then, this part examines the implications of counter-terrorism measures of the UK for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion from the Paris School point of view.

According to the Paris School, in the UK security is prioritized over liberty through reframing liberty in negative terms. The positive definition of liberty is marginalized while the negative definition of liberty is emphasized in the post 9/11 period of the UK. According to the Paris School, liberty is no longer understood in terms of civil rights and liberties but is understood as freedom from threat in the UK.

As a result of this negative understanding of liberty, right to live is considered as the most important value in the UK (Tsoukala, 2008: 74-75, 87-88).

From the perspective of the Paris School, through adopting a negative definition of liberty, counter-terrorism measures that bring restrictions in civil rights and liberties have been legitimized in the UK. It was argued by some UK officials that counter-terrorism measures that include violations in civil liberties were necessary for the protection of national security and public safety (Tsoukala, 2006: 607; Jabri, 2010: 244). For example, Minister Tony Blair, Prime Minister in the Blair Ministry, has stated that counter-terrorism laws need to be enacted in order to protect lives of British citizens and national security through emphasizing the priority of security over liberty (Blair, cited in Jones, 2005). This view is the general argument among the three subsequent governments of the UK in the post 9/11 era. In line with this thinking, in the name of national security and public safety, new counter-terrorism laws that include surveillance, control and sacrifices from civil liberties have been legislated as a response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. According to the Paris School, as a result of the justification brought by counter-terrorism laws, illiberal security practices started to be employed by the UK in the context of the war on terror. Implementation of illiberal security practices has turned into a routinized practice in the post 9/11 period (Jabri, 2010: 244; Tsoukala, 2008: 73-74, 91).

According to the Paris School, illiberal security practices implemented by the UK as a response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks have implications for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion. First of all, derogations from civil

liberties constitute one of the main considerations in the post 9/11 period for the Paris School (Jabri, 2010: 244). Counter-terrorism measures adopted by the UK in the context of the war on terror have violated civil liberties of individuals (Amnesty International, 2007). Based on the argument that the threat to public and nation is immediate and exceptional, the scope of counter-terrorism measures is held so wide that they legalize violations in basic civil liberties on the grounds of security from terror.

UK's anti-terrorism laws in the post 9/11 period include articles that bring restrictions on civil liberties. For example, with Anti Terrorism Crime and Security Act 2001, the UK has sacrificed from the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Through sacrificing from the article 5(1) of the ECHR, it is allowed to take foreigners suspected of terrorism into custody for an unlimited time period without due process. Under the provisions of ATCSA 2001, a number of men were held under custody without charge or conviction. The Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 introduced control orders that allow the Home Secretary to sacrifice from civil rights and liberties of any suspect of terrorism in the name of security from terrorism threat. According to Amnesty International (2010: 5-6), control orders restrict individual liberty to an extent that contradicts with Article 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Amnesty International argues that derogations from individual liberty under control orders have severe implications on fundamental rights of individuals such as right to privacy, right of communication.

Another striking example of violations in civil liberties in the post 9/11 period is that the government of the UK has altered its position towards torture based on the arguments of national security and public safety against terrorism. According to the decision of the Court of Appeal, information taken as a result of torture could be used as evidence in British courts on the condition that British agents would not involve in torture. The use of information learnt as a result of torture is justified on the grounds of national security and public safety (British Government's Secret Interrogation Policy Document, 2011).

Another example to the violations of civil liberties is the use of counter-terrorism stop and search powers in the name of public safety and national security from terrorism threat. Counter-terrorism stop and search powers have been used routinely by the security forces of the UK. This power has also been used disproportionately by security professionals (Travis, 2010). According to the Paris School, the adoption of such illiberal security practices by the UK in the post 9/11 period is "a specific form of governmentality" that increases and normalizes violations in civil liberties (Bigo, 2006: 47-48).

The illiberal security practices of the UK have also had implications on immigrants and asylum-seekers, according to the Paris School. In the official statements of the UK immediately after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, immigration and asylum is associated with terrorism. The presumed association between immigration and asylum on the one hand and terrorism on the other has been strengthened in the parliamentary discussions of counter-terrorism laws (Huysmans & Buonfino, 2008:

769). This presumed link between immigration, asylum and terrorism were repeated in the part 4 of UK's ATCSA 2001 on Immigration and Asylum. This part of the ATCSA legitimized unlimited detention of foreigners suspected of terrorism without due process. The Home Office of the UK revealed its five-year strategy for asylum and immigration. In this plan, immigration and asylum was presented as a security problem. This plan proposed more repressive policies against immigration and asylum rather than liberal and permissive policies. In line with these repressive policies, the UK brought restrictions in its immigration and asylum policies. For example, asylum costs were cut down. Also, surveillance on borders and ports were strengthened with the aim of preventing terrorists from crossing the border (The Home Office, 2005). As a result, from the perspective of the Paris School, the illiberal security practices of the UK in the post 9/11 period have constituted danger, unease and risk for immigrants and asylum-seekers.

From the perspective of the Paris School, the illiberal security practices of the UK have also affected social cohesion in the post 9/11 period. Authorities in the UK have acted in the post 9/11 period based on the argument that some strands of Islam that are categorized as radical pose danger to the public security and national security (Bonelli, 2008: 109-110). Therefore, there is a concern about radicalization of domestic Muslims and their suspected involvement in terrorist activities. As a result of this concern, counter-terrorism measures including violations in civil liberties have specifically targeted Muslim citizens of the UK (Bigo & Guittet, 2011: 493-494). Because of the belief in the dangerousness of specific strands of Islam, Muslim communities have been monitored in the UK with the aim of identifying aggressive

communities and radical believers. According to the authorities in the UK, the aim behind the surveillance of Muslim communities is to identify bad Muslims. Through surveillance, the security professionals in the UK want to give the message that everything is under the control of authorities. In line with this objective, the Security Service of the UK conducts missions that directly target Islamic "community" (Bonelli, 2008: 110-113). The raid on Finsbury Park mosque by the UK Security Service is one of the missions conducted against Muslim community (BBC News, 2003). Although officials, such as Hazel Blears, Home Office minister of Blair Ministry, have asserted that counter-terrorism measures do not target Muslims but target suspects of terrorism (cited in BBC News, 2005), Muslim citizens of the UK thought that counter-terrorism measures were being used against Muslims in an unfair way. As a result, domestic Muslims that were previously included into society now felt excluded from society. According to the Paris School, the illiberal security practices of the UK in the post 9/11 period have disintegrated community relations and social cohesion in the UK (Tsoukala, 2008: 71-72).

To sum up, this part of the chapter aimed to show the need to going beyond the balance argument through examining the implications of the illiberal security practices of the UK for non-state referents in the context of the war on terror from the Paris School's point of view. In line with this aim, this part presented the conception of terrorism threat and of the liberty/security relationship in the UK in the post 9/11 period by using the studies of Paris School scholars. Lastly, this part overviewed the counter-terrorism measures in the UK and their implications for civil

liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion from the Paris School point of view.

4.5 Conclusion

The main objective of Chapter 4 was to show the need for going beyond the balance argument of the relationship between liberty and security through examining the implications of the illiberal security practices of the UK for non-state referents in the context of the war on terror by bringing in the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School in a comparative manner. In line with this objective, after a brief overview of counter-terrorism legislation in the post 9/11 period of the UK, the chapter looked at the UK case from the perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School.

Both of the Schools argue that the UK legitimizes the adoption of illiberal security practices in the context of the war on terror on the grounds of security from terrorism threat. This is because the UK governments, some high ranked policy makers, and security officials in the UK see the relationship between liberty and security in balancing terms and interpret the threat of terrorism as an exceptional event requiring exceptional measures. From the perspectives of both the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School, the illiberal security practices employed by the UK in the context of the war on terror in the name of security have not created more security, but resulted in more insecurity for non-state referents.

Although security understandings of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School are different, both schools go beyond the balance argument of the relationship between liberty and security. The Aberystwyth School understands security as a positive value and equates it with emancipation. According to the Aberystwyth School, security means "freeing all human beings from unnecessary suffering" (Linklater, 2002: 303). Through this understanding, the Aberystwyth School goes beyond the balance argument. On the other hand, the Paris School questions the positive understanding of security and it considers security as a result of (in)securitization process. Security is not for all. Through this security understanding, the Paris School goes beyond the balance argument of the relationship between liberty and security.

By going beyond the balance argument, both schools focus on the implications of illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents. The Aberystwyth School focuses on the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for individuals that are Muslim citizens and non-citizens in the post 9/11 era. Muslim citizens have been subjected to social exclusion and their rights and liberties have been violated in the name of preventing "enemy within", the Aberystwyth School argues. For example, monitoring of Muslim students' and organizations' activities by university administrations, detention of Muslim students without due process, increasing number of faith crimes against domestic Muslims in the UK case (House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, 2006; Townsend, 2012) supported this argument of the Aberystwyth School.

The Aberystwyth School also argues that non-citizens' rights and liberties have also been sacrificed on the grounds of a distinction made between the rights of citizens and human rights. For example, indefinite detention of foreigners who are suspects of terrorism (ATCSA, 2001), the security practices of the UK, such as forced deportation of suspects of terrorism (Amnesty International, 2008), and the use of diplomatic assurances in the UK as counter terrorism measures (Amnesty International, 2010) supported this argument of the Aberystwyth School.

On the other hand, the Paris School emphasizes on the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion. Violation of civil liberties has constituted the main concern for the Paris School in the post 9/11 period. For example, UK's derogation from ECHR as a result of adoption of ATCSA 2001, control orders brought with The Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005, acceptance of information under torture as evidence in courts of the UK supported the concerns of the Paris School on civil liberties.

According to the Paris School, the illiberal security practices of the UK have also created unease, danger, and risk for immigrants and asylum-seekers due to the constructed association between terrorism, immigration and asylum. For instance, restrictive and repressive policies against immigration and asylum introduced in the five year strategy of the Home Office of the UK (2005) supported this argument of the Paris School.

According to the Paris School, social cohesion is also affected by the illiberal security practices of the UK. For example, some security practices of the UK governments and security professionals that target Muslim citizens such as monitoring of mosques, and the UK Security Service's raid on Finsbury mosque supported this argument of the Paris School.

In conclusion, both Schools are fruitful in terms of reflecting the insecurities faced by non-state referents in the post 9/11 era since both of them focus on security consequences for different security objects. The Aberystwyth School is more fruitful in reflecting insecurities faced by individuals in the post 9/11 era. This is because security means emancipation of all human beings from unnecessary suffering, from the Aberystwyth School perspective. Also, individual is the main referent object of security, for the Aberystwyth School. As a result, the Aberystwyth School better reflects the security consequences of illiberal security practices of liberal states for individuals in the post 9/11 era. On the other hand, the Paris School is more fruitful in terms of explaining how illiberal security practices of liberal states in the post 9/11 era turn into a form of governmentality that creates unease for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to adopt a critical perspective toward understanding the relationship between liberty and security by comparing Aberystwyth and Paris Schools and examining the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for non-state referents in the post 9/11 era from a critical perspective. In line with this aim, Chapter 2 analysed the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than states in the context of the war on terror from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School. Then, Chapter 3 examined the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for referents other than states in the context of the war on terror from the perspective of the Paris School. Lastly, Chapter 4 examined the UK as a liberal state from the perspectives of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School. Chapter 4 looked at the implications of the illiberal security practices of the UK for non-state referents in the post 9/11 period by bringing in the Aberystwyth and the Paris Schools in a comparative manner.

As it became clear in Chapter 2, through the idea of emancipation, whose one of the central values is liberty, the Aberystwyth School goes beyond the balance

argument that sees a trade-off between liberty and security. This thesis showed that by going beyond the balancing argument, the Aberystwyth School focuses on the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for individuals in the context of the war on terror. The illiberal security practices of liberal states that are the results of dualistic thinking create insecurities for Muslim citizens, immigrants and rightless people of liberal states in the post 9/11 era. This is because liberal states have adopted counter-terrorism measures based on the suspicion that the threat of terrorism may come from both the "home-grown varieties" and non-citizens.

The Aberystwyth School is critical of the communitarian categorization of Muslim people and the use of evil discourse in the context of the war on terror. From the perspective of this School, the communitarian categorization of Muslim people and the use of evil discourse have resulted in social exclusion of and derogations from liberties and rights of Muslim people. According to the Aberystwyth School, other victims of the illiberal security practices of liberal states are non-citizens that include immigrants and rightless people. The illiberal security practices of liberal states have violated the rights and liberties of non-citizens, from the Aberystwyth School point of view.

Unlike the Aberystwyth School, the Paris School questions the security understanding as a positive value and it understands security as a result of (in)securitization process. In line with this understanding of security, the Paris School argues that security has sometimes positive sometimes negative connotation for danger. As such, the Paris School goes beyond the balance argument of the

relationship between liberty and security. This thesis showed that the Paris School emphasizes the implications of the illiberal security practices of liberal states for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion by going beyond the balance argument.

For the Paris School, sacrifices from civil liberties constitute the main concern in the context of the war on terror. The curtailment of rights and liberties of individuals does not result in more security but creates further unease and risk, from the Paris School point of view. For the Paris School, the illiberal security practices of the liberal states have also had implications for immigrants and asylum-seekers in the post 9/11 era. Hardened migration and asylum policies of liberal states as a response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks have victimized immigrants and asylum-seekers. Finally, from the perspective of the Paris School, the illiberal security practices of liberal states in the post 9/11 period have disintegrated the social cohesion. This is because immigrants, asylum-seekers and domestic Muslims have been seen as the fifth column in liberal states especially after the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

Chapter 4 analyzed the UK case as a liberal state by bringing in the Aberystwyth and Paris Schools in a comparative manner. Chapter 4 looked at the reframing of terrorism threat, reframing of the relationship between liberty and security, and new counter-terrorism measures in the UK in the context of the war on terror. Chapter 4 argued that the UK governments have implemented new counter-terrorism measures that contradict with liberal principles in the name of national security and public safety in the post 9/11 era. In line with this argument, Chapter 4

showed that when it is looked from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School, the illiberal security practices of the UK has implications on non-state referents.

Chapter 4 demonstrated that from the perspective of the Aberystwyth School, the illiberal security practices of the UK have created further insecurity and fear for Muslim citizens and non-citizens of the UK by violating the civil rights and liberties of individuals. Also, Chapter 4 showed that from the perspective of the Paris School, the illiberal security practices of the UK have created further unease, risk and danger for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion. In chapter 4, it became clear that the Aberystwyth School is more fruitful in reflecting insecurities faced by individuals in the post 9/11 era while the Paris School is more fruitful in terms of explaining how illiberal security practices of liberal states in the post 9/11 era turn into a form of governmentality that creates unease for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion.

In light of these chapters, the thesis finds out that both the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School are equally fruitful in terms of reflecting and proposing solutions to the insecurities faced by non-state referents in the post 9/11 era because both Schools focus on security consequences for different referent objects of security. The Aberystwyth School is more fruitful in terms of reflecting and proposing solutions to the insecurities faced by individuals in the post 9/11 era. The Aberystwyth School focuses on insecurities faced by Muslim citizens and non-citizens of liberal states under the context of the war on terror. This is because in the

post 9/11 period, “most vulnerable” as the main referent object of security includes Muslim citizens and non-citizens of liberal states, according to the Aberystwyth School. On the other hand, the Paris School is more fruitful in terms of explaining how illiberal security practices of liberal states in the post 9/11 era turn into a form of governmentality that creates unease for civil liberties, immigrants, asylum-seekers, and social cohesion. Unlike the Aberystwyth School, the Paris School focuses on sacrifices made from civil liberties, restrictions in immigration and asylum policies and practices led to social disintegration by liberal states as its main concerns in the post 9/11 period.

Moreover, this thesis shows that although security referents focused by the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School are different, their solutions proposed to the insecurities faced by non-state referents in the post 9/11 era are overlapping. Both of them emphasize that all security practices need to be based on the understanding that security and liberty are not two conflicting values. In line with this understanding, both Schools argue that civil rights and liberties need to be protected and promoted. The Aberystwyth School emphasized the importance of human equality and the need to have the liberty to act as a full member of the political community for an emancipatory order. The Paris School argues for judicial protection of civil rights and liberties in the fight against terrorism. Also, both the Aberystwyth School and the Paris School emphasize the importance of negotiation in the fight against terrorism. The Aberystwyth School argues that mutual understanding necessary in the fight against terrorism. Similarly, the Paris School argues that protection is possible through enabling different ways of life to coexist.

Conducting an analysis on this research question has three implications. First, by answering the above research question through bringing in the Aberystwyth and Paris Schools in a comparative manner, this thesis examined critical perspectives in contrast to the traditional approaches that favor seeking a balance between security and liberty. . The result of this research offered the argument that seeing liberty and security as separate values that are in conflict with each other results in further insecurity for non-state referents in the context of the war on terror. As a result, the findings of this thesis indicated the explaining power of the critical perspectives in terms of security concerns of non-state referents in the post 9/11 period.

Second, by showing that the illiberal security practices of liberal states have created further insecurity for non-state referents, this thesis highlighted the need for going beyond the balance argument of the security/liberty relationship. The results of this thesis support the idea that in order to reflect and propose solutions to the insecurities non-state referents face in the post 9/11 period, it is necessary to go beyond the balance argument. This thesis showed that if terrorism threat is seen in terms of a balance between liberty and security, measures taken against the threat of terrorism would lead more insecurity for referent objects other than states. Therefore, there is a need for going beyond the balance argument in order to respond security concerns of non-state referents.

Last, the answer to the research question showed the importance of going beyond the balance argument, in terms of its implications for broader debates on the relationship between liberty and security. Debates on the relationship between liberty

and security have majorly revolved around the assumption that there is a balance relationship between liberty and security. By comparing two critical approaches that are the Aberystwyth School and Paris School on this research question, this thesis illustrated that there is a need for re/considering the relationship between liberty and security.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, Bruce. 2004. "The Emergency Constitution," *The Yale Law Journal* 113: 1029-1091.

Alker, Hayward. 2005. "Emancipation in the Critical Studies Project." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 189-213.

Amnesty International. 2007. *UK - Amnesty International Report 2007: Human Rights in United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*. Available from: http://www.amnesty.org/en/region/uk/report-2007

-----. 2008. *UK - Amnesty International Report 2008: Human Rights in United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*. Available from: http://www.amnesty.org/en/region/uk/report-2008

-----. 2009. *UK - Amnesty International Report 2009: Human Rights in United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*. Available from: http://www.amnesty.org/en/region/uk/report-2009#

-----. 2010. *UK - Amnesty International Report 2010: Human Rights in United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*. Available from: http://www.amnesty.org.uk/uploads/documents/doc_20709.pdf

-----. 2010. *United Kingdom Submission for the Review of Counter-Terrorism and Security Powers*. Available from: http://www.amnesty.org.uk/uploads/documents/doc_20709.pdf

-----. 2011. *Annual Report 2011: The State of the World's Human Rights, United Kingdom*. Available from: http://www.amnesty.org/en/region/uk/report-2011

Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act. 2001. Available from: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2001/24/pdfs/ukpga_20010024_en.pdf

Appleby, Nicholas. 2010. "Labelling the Innocent: How Government Counter-Terrorism Advice Creates Labels that Contribute to the Problem," *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 3 (3): 421–436.

Aradau, Claudia. 2008. "Forget Equality? Security and Liberty in the "War on Terror"," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 33: 293-314.

Aradau, Claudia, and Rens Van Munster. 2009. "Exceptionalism and the 'War on Terror': Criminology Meets International Relations," *British Journal of Criminology* 49: 686-701.

Balzacq, Thierry and et al. 2010. "Security Practices," *The International Studies Encyclopedia Online*. 1-16.

BBC News. July 8, 2005. *City Mosque Targeted by Arsonists*. Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/bradford/4665345.stm

-----. January 20, 2003. *Anti-Terror Police Raid London Mosque*. Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/2675223.stm

Berlin, Isaiah. 1958. *Two Concepts of Liberty: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered Before the University of Oxford on 31 October 1958.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bigo, Didier. 2000. "When Two Become One: Internal and External Securitisations in Europe." In Morten Kelstrup and Michael C. Williams, eds., *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration: Power, Security, and Community*. Psychology Press, 320-360.

-----. 2001. "The Möbius Ribbon of Internal and External Security(ies)." In Albert, Mathias Albert, David Jacobson and Yosef Lapid, eds., *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*. (Vol. 18) Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 91-116.

-----. 2002a. “Security and Immigration: Towards a Governmentality of Unease,” *Alternatives* 27: 63-92.

-----. 2002b. “Reassuring and Protecting: Internal Security Implications of French Participation in the Coalition against Terrorism.” In Eric Hershberg and Kevin W. Moore, eds., *Critical Views of September 11: Analyses from Around the World*. New York: The New Press, 72-91.

-----. 2006a. “Liberty, Whose Liberty? The Hague Programme and the Conception of Freedom.” In Thierry Balzacq and Sergio Carrera, eds., *Security versus Freedom?: A Challenge for Europe's Future.* Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 35-45.

-----. 2006b. “Protection: Security, Territory and Population.” In Jef Huysmans, Andrew Dobson, and Raia Prokhovnik, eds., *The Politics of Protection: Sites of Insecurity and Political Agency*. London and New York: Routledge, 84-100.

-----. 2006c. “Security, Exception, Ban and Surveillance.” In David Lyon, ed., *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond.* Willan Publishing, 46-68.

-----. 2008a. “International Political Sociology.” In Williams, Paul, ed,. *Security Studies: An Introduction*. Taylor & Francis, 116-129.

-----. 2008b. “Globalized (In)Security: The Field of Ban-Opticon.” In Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala, eds., *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes After 9/11*. New York: Routledge, 10-48.

-----. 2010a. “Delivering Liberty and Security? The Reframing of Freedom When Associated with Security.” In Didier Bigo and et al., eds., *Europe’s 21st Century Challenge: Delivering Liberty*. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 263-287.

-----. 2010b. “14 September 2001: The Regression to the Habitus.” In Alessandro Dal Lago and Salvatore Palidda, eds., *Conflict Security and the Reshaping of Society: The Civilization of War*. New York: Routledge, 103-117.

-----. 2011. “Freedom and Speed in Enlarged Borderzones.” In Vicki Squire, ed., *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity*. London and New York: Routledge, 31-50.

Bigo, Didier, and Anastassia Tsoukala (eds.) 2008. *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes After 9/11*. New York: Routledge.

-----. 2008. “Understanding (In)security.” In Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala, eds., *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes After 9/11*. New York: Routledge, 1-9.

Bigo, Didier, and Elspeth Guild. 2007. “Policing in the Name of Freedom.” In Didier Bigo and Elspeth Guild, eds., *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement Into and Within Europe.* Aldershot ; Burlington: Ashgate, 1-13.

Bigo, Didier, Elspeth Guild, and R. B. J. Walker. 2010b. “The Changing Landscape of European Liberty and Security.” In Didier Bigo and et al., eds., *Europe’s 21st Century Challenge: Delivering Liberty*. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1-27.

Bigo, Didier and Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet. 2011. “Northern Ireland as Metaphor: Exception, Suspicion and Radicalization in the ‘War on Terror’,” *Security Dialogue* 42(6): 483-498.

Bigo, Didier and et al. 2007. “The Changing Landscape of European Liberty and Security: Mid-term Report on the Results of the CHALLENGE Project,” *CEPS CHALLENGE Paper* 4: 1-45.

-----. 2009. “The Changing Landscape of European Liberty and Security: Mid-term Report of the CHALLENGE Project,” *International Social Science Journal* 59(192): 283-308.

Bigo, Didier, Philippe Bonditti, and Christian Olsson. 2010a. “Mapping the European Field of Security Professionals.” In Didier Bigo and et al., eds., *Europe’s 21st Century Challenge: Delivering Liberty*. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 49-63.

Bilgin, Pinar. 1999. “Security Studies: Theory/Practice,” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 12 (2): 31–42.

-----. 2002. “Beyond Statism in Security Studies? Human Agency and Security in the Middle East,” *The Review of International Affairs* 2(1): 100-118.

-----. 2003. “Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security,” *The International Studies Review* 5 (2): 203–222.

-----. 2008. “Critical Theory.” In Paul Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction*. Taylor & Francis, 89-102.

-----. 2010. “Güvenlik Çalışmalarında Yeni Açılımlar: Yeni Güvenlik Çalışmaları (New Approaches on Security Studies: New Security Studies),” *Stratejik Araştırmalar*, 8(14): 69-96.

Bilgin, Pınar, Ken Booth, and Richard Wyn Jones. 1998. “Security Studies: the Next Stage?,” *Nacao e Defesa* 84 (2): 148.

Blair, Tony. September 12, 2001a. “Full Text of Tony Blair’s Speech,” *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2001/sep/12/politicalnews.september111?INTCMP=SRCH

-----. October 2, 2001b. “Full Text: Tony Blair's Speech (part one),” *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2001/oct/02/labourconference.labour6

-----. November 17, 2003. “Blair: Stand Firm with U.S. on Terror,” *CNN World*. Available from: http://articles.cnn.com/2003-11-17/world/britain.blair_1_steel-tariffs-blair-terror?_s=PM:WORLD

-----. March 5, 2004. “Full Text: Tony Blair's Speech,” *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/mar/05/iraq.iraq

-----. July 16, 2005a. “Full Text: Blair Speech on Terror,” *BBC News*. Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4689363.stm

-----. August 5, 2005b. *The Prime Minister's Statement on Anti-Terror Measures: Full-Text*. Available from: http://www.statewatch.org/news/2005/aug/02pm-terror-statement.htm

-----. September 11, 2011. "'It's not Over,' Says Tony Blair about the War on Terror on the Eve of 9/11," *Mail Online*. Available from: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2035838/9-11-anniversary-Tony-Blair-says-war-terror-over.html

Bonelli, Laurent. 2008. "Hidden in Plain Sight: Intelligence, Exception and Suspicion after 11 September 2001." In Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala, eds., *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes after 9/11*. New York: Routledge, 100-120.

Booth, Ken. 1991a. *New Thinking about Strategy and International Security*. London: HarperCollins Academic.

-----. 1991b. "Security and Emancipation," *Review of International Studies* 17 (4): 313–326.

-----. 1991c. "War, Security and Strategy: Towards a Doctrine for Stable Peace." In Ken Booth, ed., *New Thinking on Strategy and International Security*. London: Harper Collins, 335-76.

-----. 1991d. "Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice," *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 67 (3): 527–545.

-----. 1995. "Human Wrongs and International Relations," *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 71 (1): 103–126.

-----. 1997. "Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist." In Keith Krause and Michael Williams, eds., *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: UCL Press, 83-119.

-----. 1999. "Three Tyrannies." In Tim Dunne and Nicholas J. Wheeler, eds., *Human Rights in Global Politics*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 31-70.

----- (ed.) 2005. *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

-----. 2005a. “Critical Explorations.” In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1-20.

-----. 2005b. “Introduction to Part 1.” In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 21-27.

-----. 2005c. “Introduction to Part 2.” In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 109-113.

-----. 2005d. “Introduction to Part 3.” In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 181-189.

-----. 2005e. “Beyond Critical Security Studies.” In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 259-279.

-----. 2006. "Two Terrors, One Problem." In Ersel Aydınlı and James Rosenau, eds., *Globalization, Security, and the Nation State: Paradigms in Transition*. SUNY Press, 27-48.

-----. 2007. *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----. 2008. "The Human Faces of Terror: Reflections in a Cracked Looking-Glass," *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 1 (1): 65–79.

Booth, Ken, and Nicholas J. Wheeler. 1992. “Contending Philosophies about Security in Europe.” In Colin McInnes, ed., *Strategy and Security in the New Europe*. London: Routledge, 3-36.

Booth, Ken and Peter Vale. 1997. “Critical Security Studies and Regional Insecurity: The Case of Southern Africa.” In Keith Krause and Michael Williams, eds., *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: UCL Press, 329-358

Booth, Ken and Tim Dunne (eds.) 2002. *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

-----. 2002. "Worlds in Collision." In Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, eds., *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-27.

-----. 2011. *Terror in Our Time*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, New York: Routledge.

Bovard, James. 2003. *Terrorism and Tyranny: Trampling Freedom, Justice, and Peace to Rid the World of Evil.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

British Government's Secret Interrogation Policy Document. August 4, 2011. *Agency Policy on Liaison with Overseas Security and Intelligence Services in Relation to Detainees who may be Subject to Mistreatment*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/law/interactive/2011/aug/04/mi6-torture-interrogation-policy-document

Brown, Gordon. March 22, 2009. We are about to Take the War against Terror to A New Level," *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/mar/22/gordon-brown-terrorism

Cameron, David. December 31, 2010. "Cameron Warns of New Year Terror Alert and Urges British Muslims to Help Fight Extremism," *Mail Online*. Available from: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1342901/David-Cameron-warns-New-Year-terror-alert-urges-British-Muslims-help-fight-extremism.html

-----. February 5, 2011. *PM's Speech at Munich Security Conference*. Available from: http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference/

Cameron, David, and Nick Clegg. 2010. *The Coalition: Our Programme for Government*. London: Crown Copyright.

C.A.S.E. Collective. 2006. "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto." *Security Dialogue,* 37 (4): 443-487.

Counter-Terrorism Act. 2008. Available from: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/28/pdfs/ukpga_20080028_en.pdf

Cowan, Rosie. January 14, 2005. “Police Fear Bali-Style Club Bomb in London,” *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2005/jan/14/terrorism.london

Department for Education and Skills. 2006. *Promoting Good Campus Relations: Working with Staff and Students to Build Community Cohesion and Tackle Violent Extremism in the Name of Islam at Universities and Colleges*. Available from: http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/6951/1/ExtremismGuidancefinal.pdf

Dodd, Vikram. October 16, 2006. “Universities Urged to Spy on Muslims,” *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2006/oct/16/highereducation.topstories3

Doyle, Michael W. 1986. “Liberalism and World Politics,” *The American Political Science Review* 80(4): 1151-1169.

Dunne, Tim and Nicholas J. Wheeler. 2004. "‘We the Peoples’: Contending Discourses of Security in Human Rights Theory and Practice," *International Relations* 18 (1): 9–23.

Etzioni, Amitai. 2004. *How Patriotic is the Patriot Act?: Freedom versus Security in the Age of Terrorism*. New York: Routledge.

-----. 2007. *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Galston, William A. 1991. *Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues, and Diversity in the Liberal State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Golder, Ben, and George Williams. 2006. “Balancing National Security and Human Rights: Assessing the Legal Response of Common Law Nations to the Threat of Terrorism,” *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 8(1): 43-62.

Guild, Elspeth. 2003. “International Terrorism and EU Immigration, Asylum and Borders Policy: The Unexpected Victims of 11 September 2001,” *European Foreign Affairs Review* 8: 331-346.

Hobbes, Thomas. 1651. *Leviathan*. 1999. (Reprint). Eugene, Oregon: The University of Oregon.

Hoffman, Bruce. 2002. "Rethinking Terrorism and Counterterrorism since 9/11," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 25: 303–316.

Home Office. 2005. *Controlling Our Borders: Making Migration Work for Britain. In Five Year Strategy for Asylum and Immigration*. Available from: http://www.archive2.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm64/6472/6472.pdf

Horne, Alexander. 2010. "Reviewing Counter-Terrorism Legislation," *Key Issues for the New Parliament 2010 House of Commons Library Research.* Available from: http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons/lib/research/key_issues/Key%20Issues%20Reviewing%20counter-terrorism%20legislation.pdf

House of Commons Home Affairs Committee. June 20, 2006. *Terrorism Detention Powers: Fourth Report of Session 2005-2006* (Vol. 1). Available from: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmhaff/910/910i.pdf

Human Rights First. 2007. *Islamophobia: 2007 Hate Crime Survey*. Available from: http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/07601-discrim-hc-islamophobia-web.pdf

Huysmans, Jef. 2000. "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies 38*(5): 751–777.

-----. 2006a. "Agency and the Politics of Protection." In Jef Huysmans, Andrew Dobson and Raia Prokhovnik, eds., *The Politics of Protection: Sites of Insecurity and Political Agency.* New York: Routledge, 1-18.

-----. 2006b. "International Politics of Insecurity: Normativity, Inwardness and the Exception," *Security Dialogue* 37: 11-29.

-----. 2006c. *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration, and Asylum in the EU*. New York: Routledge.

Huysmans, Jef and Alessandra Buonfino. 2008. “Politics of Exception and Unease: Immigration, Asylum and Terrorism in Parliamentary Debates in the UK,” *Political Studies* 56(4): 766-788.

Jabri, Vivienne. 2006. “War, Security and the Liberal State,” *Security Dialogue* 37(1): 47-64.

-----. 2010. “Violence and Exceptionalism in Contemporary Politics: War, Liberty; Security.” In Didier Bigo and et al., eds., *Europe’s 21st Century Challenge: Delivering Liberty*. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 238-250.

Jackson, Richard. 2007. "Constructing Enemies: ‘Islamic Terrorism’ in Political and Academic Discourse," *Government & Opposition* 42 (3): 394–426.

Jackson, Richard, Jeroen Gunning, and Marie Breen Smyth. 2007. “The Case for a Critical Terrorism Studies,” *Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association*.

Jones, George. 2005. “We must Put Safety before Liberty, Says Blair,” *The Telegraph*. Available from: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1484284/We-must-put-safety-before-liberty-says-Blair.html

Kessler, Oliver, and Wouter Werner. 2008. “Extrajudicial Killing as Risk Management,” *Security Dialogue* 39: 289-308.

Kilfoyle, Peter. 2004. “Tony Blair Will Not Be Forgiven,” *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/mar/16/terrorism.britainand911

Krause, Keith, and Michael C. Williams. 1996. “Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods,” *Mershon International Studies Review* 40(2): 229-254.

----- (eds.) 1997. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: UCL Press.

Kreisler, Harry. March 9, 2004. Interview with Robert Keohane. Institute of International Studies, UC Berkeley. Available from: http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people4/Keohane/keohane-con5.html

-----. November 15, 2005. Interview with Stephen Walt. Institute of International Studies, UC Berkeley. Available from: http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people5/Walt/walt-con3.html

LIBERTY. 2012. *Deportation to Torture*. Available from: http://www.liberty-human-rights.org.uk/human-rights/torture/deportation-to-torture/index.php

Linklater, Andrew. 2001. "Citizenship, Humanity, and Cosmopolitan Harm Conventions," *International Political Science Review* 22 (3): 261–277.

-----. 2002a. "Cosmopolitan Political Communities in International Relations," *International Relations* 16 (1): 135–150.

-----. 2002b. "Unnecessary Suffering." In Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, eds., *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 303-313.

-----. 2005. "Political Community and Human Security." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 113-133.

-----. 2007. "Torture and Civilisation," *International Relations* 21 (1): 111–118.

Locke, John. 1689. *Two Treaties of Government*. 1823. (Reprint). London: n.p.

May, Theresa. 2011. *Review of Counter-Terrorism and Security Powers: Review Findings and Recommendations*. Available from: http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/counter-terrorism/review-of-ct-security-powers/review-findings-and-rec?view=Binary

McDonald, Matt. 2007. "Emancipation and Critical Terrorism Studies," *European Political Science* 6 (3): 252–259.

Mearsheimer, John J. 2002. “Hearts and Minds,” *The National Interest* 69.

Metropolitan Police Service. January 16, 2008. “Communities Together,” *Community Information Bulletin* 112. Available from: http://www.met.police.uk/communities_together/docs/bulletin_112.pdf.

MI5, 2012a. *The Nature of the Threat*. Available from: https://www.mi5.gov.uk/output/the-nature-of-the-threat.html

-----. 2012b. *The Trajectory of the Threat*. Available from: https://www.mi5.gov.uk/output/the-trajectory-of-the-threat.html

Miliband, David. February 21, 2008. “In full: Miliband Rendition Statement,” *BBC News*. Availbale from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/7257500.stm

Morgenthau, Hans. 1973. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (5th ed.) New York: Knopf.

Oriola, Temitope. 2009. "Counter-Terrorism and Alien Justice: the Case of Security Certificates in Canada," *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 2 (2): 257–274.

Parekh, Bhikhu. 2002. “Terrorism or Intercultural Dialogue.” In Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, eds., *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 270-284.

Prevention of Terrorism Act. 2005. Available from: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/2/pdfs/ukpga_20050002_en.pdf

Richards, Glyn. 1991. *The Philosophy of Gandhi*. London: Curzon Press.

Ruane, Joseph and Jennifer Todd. 2005. “Communal Conflict and Emancipation: The Case of Northern Ireland.” In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 237-255.

Rugoff, Nick and Christopher Howell. March 15, 2011. Interview with Bruce Hoffman.

Salter, Mark B. 2010. “Surveillance.” In J. Peter Burgess, ed., *The Routledge Handbook of New Security Studies.* London; New York: Routledge, 187-196.

Schwarzenberger, George. 1941. *Power Politics: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations and Post-War Planning*. London: J. Cape.

Smith, Steve. 2005. “The Contested Concept of Security.” In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 27-62.

Starr, Paul. 2002. "Liberty since 9-11," *The American Prospect* 13(2).

-----. 2007. *Freedom’s Power: The True Force of Liberalism*. New York: Basic Books.

Terriff, Terry, and et al. 1999. *Security Studies Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Terrorism Act. 2000. Available from: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/11/pdfs/ukpga_20000011_en.pdf

Terrorism Act. 2006. Available from: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/11/pdfs/ukpga_20060011_en.pdf

Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures Act. 2011. Available from: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/23/pdfs/ukpga_20110023_en.pdf

Tesón. Fernando R. 2005. "Liberal Security." In Richard Ashby Wilson, ed., *Human Rights in the 'War on Terror'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-77.

Townsend, Mark. July 14, 2012. “Police 'Made up' Evidence against Muslim Student,” *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2012/jul/14/police-evidence-muslim-student-rizwaan-sabir

Travis, Alan. January 12, 2010. “Stop and Search Powers Illegal, European Court Rules,” *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/jan/12/stop-and-search-ruled-illegal

Tsoukala, Anastassia. 2006. “Democracy in the Light of Security: British and French Political Discourses on Domestic Counter-Terrorism Policies,” *Political Studies* 54(3): 607-627.

-----. 2007. “Looking at Migrants as Enemies.” In Didier Bigo and Elspeth Guild, eds., *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement Into and Within Europe.* Aldershot ; Burlington: Ashgate, 161-192.

-----. 2008. “Defining the Terrorist Threat in the Post-September Era.” In Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala, eds., *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes After 9/11*. New York: Routledge, 49-99.

Waldron, Jeremy. 2003. "Security and Liberty: The Image of Balance," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 11(2): 191-210.

Walt, Stephen. 1991. “The Renaissance of Security Studies,” *International Studies Quarterly* 35: 211-239.

Wheeler, Nicholas J. 1996. "Guardian Angel or Global Gangster: A Review of the Ethical Claims of International Society," *Political Studies* 44 (1): 123–135.

Wilkinson, Paul. 1986. *Terrorism and the Liberal State*. London: Macmillan Education LTD.

-----. 2011. *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*. New York: Routledge.

Wintour, Patrick. November 12, 2002. “Blair: The Daily Threat of Terror,” *The Guardian*. Available from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2002/nov/12/uk.iraq

Wright, David and et al. 2010. “Sorting Out Smart Surveillance,” *Computer Law and Security Review* 26: 343-354.

Wyn Jones, Richard. 1995. "'Message in a Bottle'? Theory and Praxis in Critical Security Studies," *Contemporary Security Policy* 16 (3): 299–319.

-----. 1996. "Travel without Maps: Thinking about Security after the Cold War." In M. Jane Davis, ed., *Security Issues in the Post-Cold War*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 196-218.

-----. 1999. *Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory*. Lynne Rienner Pub.

-----. 2005. "On Emancipation: Necessity, Capacity, and Concrete Utopias." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 189-215.